

WASHINGTON.

Guy A. Hamilton, Leavenworth.

WISCONSIN.

Adolph H. Dionne, Lena.

T. J. Griffin, Prescott.

John P. Rice, Sparta.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 30, 1913.

POSTMASTERS.

OHIO.

T. O. Armstrong to be postmaster at Middle Point, in the State of Ohio.

Albert M. Sigle to be postmaster at Calla, in the State of Ohio.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 31, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, in presenting petitions in behalf of the joint resolution designed to result in the amendment of the Constitution with reference to woman suffrage it is not my purpose to detain the Senate any longer than to say a word of encouragement to those who have come here with petitions and those whom they represent throughout the length and breadth of the land.

A few days ago the American Senate witnessed a strange spectacle, a spectacle that a few years ago no man in this body would have believed would ever have been witnessed within these walls within his own lifetime. During my own short service in this body I remember a plea I made for the right of the American people to elect their Senators, and it was met with scorn and derision by Members of this body, and one distinguished Senator could show his contempt for the proposition in no other way than by leaving the Chamber. But a few days ago the people of Georgia having elected a Member of this body that Senator was sworn into office, the first in the history of this Republic elected by a vote of the people themselves. And I want to say to the women who have come to Washington with these petitions, and through them and through this occasion to the women of America, that it took the men of America almost a century and a quarter to get the right to elect an American Senator.

But, Mr. President, there is a law of human nature in free government that is as resistless as the law under which the tide ebbs and flows. That law, briefly stated, is that if you give man the right to participate at all in free government you may throw around him every check which human ingenuity can conceive and it will prove fruitless, for he will burn away those checks and balances and will reduce free government to its last analysis, which is a government by the people. He will sooner or later bring himself directly in touch with the election of every officer connected with the government, and he will at the same time develop those instrumentalities of government which will make those to whom authority is temporarily and for the time being delegated servants and not masters of the people, who create the office and select the representative.

With that law in view and with the experience of the American people in finally effectuating the direct election of American Senators, I want to say to the womanhood of America that whatever the fate of this joint resolution may be, whatever the fate of this present movement may be, by that resistless law which I have referred to the time is not far distant, the time is inevitable, when the American people will confer upon American womanhood the only peaceable weapon known to free government for her own protection, for the protection of her property and the protection of her children, and that is the ballot.

Mr. President, on behalf of the women of Minnesota I take pleasure in presenting these petitions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, it was my pleasure and privilege with a number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to go to Hyattsville this morning to meet the ladies who are the representatives of the several States with petitions asking for the support of Congress to Senate joint resolution No. 1.

This is one of the progressive movements of the age, Mr. President. I know that in days gone by the man who advocated woman suffrage was looked down upon in the community in which he lived just as the man who advocated the direct election of Senators by the people was looked upon as a man "fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils." But a movement which had for its purpose the direct election of Senators by the people has become a fixity in a law of Congress. So the movement now which has for its purpose the enfranchisement of woman, although in some sections of our country it is bitterly opposed, will eventually become a part of national law just as it has become a part of the law of several of the States.

It is a movement which is absolutely certain of accomplishment, Mr. President, because it is right. There is no reason in the world why the women of this country should not be permitted to exercise the right of suffrage. They are the equals of men in all that goes for the making of a better State, and they are the superiors of men in all that goes to make for a higher and loftier citizenship.

It can be safely said that in every State of the Union where a great moral question is involved and where the women have the right to exercise the privilege of voting, the woman is found also on the right side, because her heart is in the home, her home is her shrine, and she strives rather for those things which will be better for the home life than for those things which may be best for the building up of a political party.

I take great pleasure, Mr. President, in presenting petitions from the people of my State, which has only recently, after a battle of 30 years, enfranchised the women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to add my tribute to the eulogy that has been pronounced upon the women of the country by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] and to state my approval of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Early in Kansas there was extended to the women the privilege of voting in the election of school officers and in the control of school affairs. Shortly after I made that State my home I attended a meeting for the election of school officers. I observed the farmers coming in from over the country with their wives to attend the meeting and elect the officers who would control the affairs of the schools for the coming year. It was an election carried on in the most orderly and creditable manner. That was my first observation as to the operation of woman suffrage, and I thought then that such a policy was a very fitting thing.

Later in our State there was extended to the women the privilege of voting in municipal affairs. That movement was resisted with great determination by the evil influences of society, and similar arguments to those that have been made against the present movement for woman's enfranchisement were made against the proposition to give them the right of suffrage in municipal elections. But the right was conferred, and the result has been a better condition in every town in Kansas than that which existed before this right was conferred.

The influence of the women in the municipal elections of Kansas has been for the betterment of moral conditions as well as business conditions in that State. It has made the polling place a more respectable place than it was before it was visited by their refining presence, and it has added to the intellectual as well as the moral uplifting of the municipalities of our State.

After a struggle of 20 years and more, the friends of woman suffrage succeeded last year in conferring the right of suffrage universally in our State, and, judging from the experience of the past, I know that it will have the same beneficial influence in State affairs that it had in our school affairs and in our municipal affairs.

The State that withholds the right from its women of participating in the affairs of its government is doing itself an injustice, because their participation in the affairs of the State will benefit every Commonwealth that enjoys that privilege. It has been my great pleasure to campaign the States where woman suffrage has been extended, and I observed in the audiences larger numbers of women than in the audiences where the right of suffrage had not been extended; and for intelligent understanding of intricate economic questions they are the equals of men. You will find a larger percentage of women in your audiences in a State where suffrage is enjoyed by them who understand and are informed in regard to the political and complex problems that confront our civilization than you will men. I have no patience with the argument that they have not the capacity to deal with questions relating to governmental affairs.

There is no sound argument that can be made against the extension of woman suffrage. Prejudices exist against it, but there is no argument against it. It is with great pleasure that I avail myself of this opportunity to speak a word in behalf of this great movement, and it is my opinion that when suffrage is universally extended, as it soon will be, the elevation of our political affairs to a higher moral plane will follow. The influence of women will place the political institutions of our country upon a higher plane than they have been in the past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, from the day Utah was granted statehood, more than 17 years ago, the women of that State have enjoyed the privilege of unrestricted suffrage, equal in every respect to that enjoyed by the men. Since that privilege was granted them they have taken an active interest in the precinct primaries and ward, city, county, and State conventions. They have participated in the deliberations of the primaries and conventions. Their advice and counsel have often been sought, received, and acted upon. It is true they have sought political office, and have been elected by the vote of the people to positions of great responsibility; but in no case has a woman become a candidate for an office for which she was not capable of filling or by nature fitted to hold. They have been elected as members of the State senate and house of representatives, and filled the requirements of those important offices with credit to themselves and honor to the State.

Mr. President, the three greatest callings the Master intended womankind to properly and successfully fill in this life are those of daughter, wife, mother. If I thought that the granting of equal suffrage would interfere with these divinely intended spheres of women, I would do all in my power to defeat it; but from the results following the granting of woman suffrage in my own State, I am pleased to say that no evil effects have followed, but, on the contrary, a better condition in public affairs has been the result. The granting of suffrage to woman has made no daughter less beautiful or chaste, no wife less devoted or loving, no mother less inspiring and watchful.

My wife has taken an interest in politics, but it did not rob her of any of her womanly instincts; it did not make her a less capable wife or interfere with her loving devotion to her children. I must admit that I have had fears of the result of woman suffrage in the great cities of this country; but it may be that laws can be passed that will eliminate the evils I have in mind. I have thought that a constitutional amendment was not necessary, because every State in the Union can grant complete suffrage to every woman within its borders if the legislature of the State so decides.

The logic of common sense has been the force that has removed prejudice against admitting women to equal rights with men, and I have no doubt but that it will become universal in this country. When that day arrives the credit for success should not, in my opinion, be given to the modern militant suffragette, but to the womanly woman of to-day interested in the subject, and to such women as J. Ellen Foster, Belva Lockwood, Clara Barton, Miss Anthony, and many women of our Western States. J. Ellen Foster did more for the cause of woman suffrage than a thousand Mrs. Pankhursts; Mrs. Belva Lockwood a thousand times more than the fanatical suicide Miss Davison. I do not believe it possible that the American people will give the credit for success to the great move for the betterment of women to the eleventh hour militant fanatical suffragettes, instead of the patient, honest, pure, and lovable women that are to-day fighting for the cause and those that were in the fight when it was an unpopular cause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, Senate joint resolution No. 1 has been favorably reported by a standing committee of this body and is now on the calendar awaiting consideration by the Senate. That joint resolution provides for an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women. I have been asked to present to the Senate some petitions in behalf of the passage of the joint resolution. I am glad to present those petitions, because I think their prayer ought to be granted and that the joint resolution ought to pass. This petition from a part of the people of this country who have heretofore not had the right to vote would, if granted, make this Government in truth and in fact a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I do not propose now to take the time of the Senate to discuss the merits of the proposition. That I shall do when the

resolution is up for consideration. I simply want to say that I come from a State where the right of suffrage has been extended to women, and that none of the prophecies of those who were opposed to it have been fulfilled, and that practically all the hopes of those who were in favor of it have been realized. What has come to pass in my State I believe will come to pass in other States.

I hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution. If the Congress should not pass such a joint resolution, I am satisfied that, notwithstanding our failure to do so, the right of suffrage will be extended State by State until the women in every State in the Union will have equal rights to vote with men, and that the same advantages, the same benefits, and the same uplifting influence that have resulted in our State will result in the other States of the Union.

Mr. President, I am glad to present these petitions, and I hope that in the very near future the Senate will have an opportunity to consider and to pass joint resolution No. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Commonwealth which I have the honor in part to represent in this Chamber was a pioneer in the field of woman suffrage. It followed the splendid example set in its Territorial days by the State which borders it upon the north, to the contagion of whose influence in that regard we yielded, and which, tested by the experiences of time, has been most salutary.

As I said in this Chamber a few mornings ago, woman suffrage in Colorado is no longer an experiment. It has been tried, and it has risen in full measure to the expectations of those who were originally its advocates. I think, therefore, I can speak as one with authority when I say that the extension of the franchise to both sexes simply extends the area of that privilege to the limit which is demanded by the principle of universal suffrage.

When I consider that every argument which is made against this right and every objection which is presented to its exercise have been the identical arguments and the identical objections with which every extension of it has been confronted and which have always been overcome, I am constrained to believe that they will be no more effective now than they have been in the past.

Manhood suffrage, Mr. President, has been a plant of somewhat deliberate growth. It has from a restricted condition been extended from time to time, until long ago it embraced all men professing allegiance to the Government of the United States; and, as was said by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], this has simply been the obedience of progress to the law of evolution, the ultimate growth of which is the extension of the principle to the men and women of every State.

Mr. President, this is not a government of good men. Some contend that the high intelligence and morality of that part of the people, possessing these elements in an extraordinary degree, should alone be invested with the power and authority of government. Others inveigh against the extension and exercise of political power to those who are of low intelligence, who are immoral, who are indifferent, or who are criminal. Some would have the suffrage confined to those in the enjoyment and the possession of property; others think that an educational qualification should be the measure and the standard of the right of suffrage. All these contentions may be correct in the abstract; but each and all of them, Mr. President, seem to ignore the fundamental proposition that this is not a government of good people; it is not a government of indifferent people; it is not a government of wicked people; it is a government of all the people, which includes all sorts and conditions of men; and it could not be the government that it is were conditions otherwise. Men have the right and power of representation as units of that compendious whole which we call the people, composed of the good and the bad, the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, and these should also include the women as they do the men of this country.

I am not one of those, Mr. President, who predicted at the time, or who has expected since, that the enjoyment of the suffrage by the women of my State would result in that tremendous change for the better which sentimentalists have ascribed as the chief basis of this mighty movement and which must result from its establishment. I have always recognized the fact that men and women are the components of a common race, inspired by the same ambitions, animated by the same passions, involved in the same destiny, and bound together by the indissoluble laws of nature for good and for evil. Each lives under the laws of a common country; each is responsible for their infraction; each should enjoy to the fullest extent their privileges. That being so, it follows logically that both

should have a part and parcel in the making, in the administration, and in the enforcement of the laws; and not until this right shall have become coequal with the physical boundaries of the country will this Government be in very truth "a government of, for, and by the people."

Mr. President, it was said many years ago that every civilization has its standard, and that standard is the position of woman in society. That is true. Precisely as she proceeds in an upward progress from the menial position of a slave to the equal of man will be the rise and progress of civilization from its rudiments toward its rounded and perfect end.

I look for no great transformation in morals or in conduct through equal suffrage; I look for no great transformation in ideals in the administration of our affairs in this country; but I do expect, as I have seen, a wondrous improvement in our public conditions, in our public morality, and in our Government by enlisting in the cause, the common cause, the public cause, all those elements of womanhood which man is always ready to acknowledge and which constitute the chief attraction and glory of our wives, our mothers, and our sisters. These are the elements which are needed to round out and make complete that political society which began with the organization of this Government under the Constitution of the United States and which has been in process of development ever since.

Mr. President, this result is coming; nothing can prevent it, because it is the necessary outgrowth of existing conditions. It may be retarded here; obstacles may interfere with its progress yonder; but just as surely as the procession of the equinoxes, State after State, unmindful of what we may do in the Congress of the United States, will join the phalanx of Commonwealths which now recognize the principle of universal suffrage, until every State in the Union shall have granted that boon to womankind, obstacles to the attaining of which, through toil, struggle, and persistency, shall have been overcome, as they have been overcome by the men of the land, who have wrested for themselves this great weapon from the strong hands of wealth and privilege.

I trust, Mr. President, that as soon as the pending important business of this Chamber shall be behind us we will take up, consider, and pass the joint resolution which has been favorably recommended to the consideration of this body by the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I present a number of petitions from citizens of the State of Colorado asking the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. President, it was said by an eminent writer that the powers of government are either delegated or assumed; that all powers not delegated are assumed, and all assumed powers are usurpations. When we examine the history of the formation of our Government we inquire where did woman ever delegate to man the power to make laws not only for himself but also for her without her consent or knowledge? We can find no answer to that except that there was no such delegation of power. As the power was not delegated, it was assumed, and hence was an usurpation.

We have recognized in our Declaration of Independence, the charter of our liberties, that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. Knowing that woman is an element of society that is governed, logically, under the Declaration of Independence, there must be a consent upon her part in order to make just government. As that consent under our system can only be obtained under the elective franchise, the moral right of woman to vote is clear and conclusive.

Objection is no longer urged upon that ground; it is now made upon the ground that it is inexpedient. It is claimed that we will inject into politics an element that will degrade our elections. Can that be true when we know who are the parties to be given the franchise? Who are they? They are our mothers, our wives, our sisters, and our daughters; and is there a man in high or low position who does not recognize that there can be no contamination from that source, but that it is an elevating influence? No man will admit that his mother, his sister, his wife, or his daughter would be more likely to commit election frauds than himself; and that being the case, where can women be an influence for evil?

But it is said that the good women will not vote and that the bad women will vote. The reverse of that is the true condition, as shown in those States which have adopted equal suffrage. We know that the good women do vote; we know that they vote in almost as large proportion as do the men.

It is said that in my State 80 per cent of the women vote, and it has been tested and shown to be true by a great many of the tabulations of the women's vote in various counties of my State. It is said that 85 per cent of the men vote, and that in the same way has been verified. In that proportion of 80 per cent you can readily see how many of the good women of the State of Colorado vote.

It is said that the bad women will control the elections; but we know that the reverse of that is true because they are so few in number. There is not over 1 per cent or, it has been estimated, one-half of 1 per cent of immoral women in the State of Colorado or in any other State, and it is impossible for that small proportion to have an appreciable influence upon elections.

But in the practical operation of woman suffrage we find that the bad women will not vote unless they are almost forced to do so, and there is a good reason for it. In the first place they do not want their names to be known. Nearly all of them go under assumed names. They do not want to go to the election polls. Generally, the police or the sheriff's office of a county commands them to vote in order to get them to go to the polls at all. Thus the contention that has been made that bad women would control elections, that bad women would be eager to go and vote, is absolutely untrue. They are the ones that want to shirk a vote. They know that they are liable to prosecution. They know that unless they cast their lot with the winning party they may lose out entirely and thus have their avocation stopped.

On the other hand, the good women are as much interested in proper government as men. Their properties are as liable to excessive or wrongful taxation and assessment as those of men. Their personal liberty and rights are as sacred to them as to men. The election polls, except a few in the low parts of the cities, are as respectable places of meeting as dry goods stores. Consequently they readily go to the polls and cast their votes.

Since we have no law of primogeniture in the United States every generation now has property conveyed by will or by descent to men and women in equal parts. Thus, in every generation one-half of the entire property of the United States goes to women. We declared in our colonial days the principle that taxation without representation is tyranny. Is it possible that taxation of women's property, when every generation places in their hands one-half of all the property in the United States, is not subject also to the same criticism that was made in the days of 1776? Should not woman have the right to protect herself against excessive assessments and taxation upon her property?

The influence of woman has always been for good, both in conventions and elections. Let a man of immoral character become a candidate for office in my State and his chances of nomination or election are very slight.

All of us know that to a great extent many feel the obligations of party; and when a man is put forth as the candidate of one's party they often say, "Well, we were not for him, but we will take him and let the judgment of the party stand." Often you hear a man say, "I know that the candidate who received the nomination is a rascal, but I must have my party record consistent." He has a motive in that declaration; he expects to seek political preferment in the future. But woman has no record to keep consistent. She is not a seeker after office. She is an independent element in politics. Therefore, when she casts her vote, she votes for the candidate whom she thinks is best qualified to fill the position.

Consequently, from the standpoint both of right and good government, this joint resolution should be adopted. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Colorado will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have the honor to represent here in part a State that has granted the franchise to its women. I am proud of the women of my State. For intelligence, refinement, and patriotism they have no superiors in any other State or nation. I have always taken pride in the campaign that they waged in my State to secure the franchise. It was a dignified, earnest appeal to the judgment, reason, and conscience of men. There were no parades, no displays, no attempts to appeal to the passions or the prejudices of men. I am proud of the men of my State who were broad minded and far seeing and patriotic enough to grant the franchise to their women.

I am sorry to hear any woman demand the suffrage as a right or claim it as a privilege. I should rather hear her call for it as giving her the opportunity to perform a sacred duty she owes to her country and her State, an opportunity that will

enable her to assist in raising the standard of politics, of citizenship, and the purity of our civic life.

It has been claimed that if granted the right, most women would not exercise the suffrage, and that of those who did vote the majority would be women of low degree and immoral women. The contrary has been proved in my State. I have here an account given of an election held in the city of Los Angeles within the last few weeks. That city is one of the most progressive in this country. It was an election for city officers that should have called out the full vote of the city. I have said many times and I should like to impress it upon this presence, that one of the greatest dangers confronting this country to-day is the indifference of the voters, and especially of the so-called good citizens. It is not an unusual thing to find after the polls are closed in a hotly contested campaign that less than 50 per cent of the registered votes have been cast. In this particular instance the votes cast by the men and women of my home city are compared in detail in a tabulated statement, and following that is this statement of the result:

A notable piece of political science work was accomplished recently by a committee of earnest women in the checking up of the 90,000 votes cast at the recent city election to discover what percentage of the vote was cast by their sex. Immediately after the election the statement was made in several newspapers that only 20 per cent of the vote was cast by women. As that would call for only 18,000 feminine votes—and there were 73,000 women registered—it seemed to show a sad lack of interest on the part of the newly made voters.

The election books were thrown open by the city clerk and the names of voters were checked. Where a woman signed as "Mrs." or "Miss" or where the first name was evidently feminine the vote was credited to the woman's column, but in the case of mere initials, like "E. A. Smith," which might have been Emma A. Smith, it was surrendered to the men. Even with this margin against them, the percentage of registered women voting was 50.2 per cent as against the 54.2 per cent by the men. The women's share of the total was 41.3; and on separating the vote by districts the interesting fact appeared that the highest percentages of women's vote appeared in the most prosperous residence districts and the smallest in the poorest districts. This was a valuable bit of investigation.

C. D. W.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in reading this statement, but I ask unanimous consent to include it as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. WORKS. I am strongly in favor of this amendment.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the California Outlook, Saturday, June 21, 1913.]

THE RECORD WOMEN MADE AT LOS ANGELES ELECTION.

It has been a more or less popular argument with opponents of woman suffrage that, having once attained to the ballot, women would not vote. But a more frequently used declaration was that fashionable and highly cultured women would not visit the polls, leaving that duty of citizenship to their humbler sisters. Both of these arguments seem to have been proven fallacies by the result of the recent municipal election in Los Angeles. At any rate, it was demonstrated that the women established a voting average which compares quite favorably with that of the men, this notwithstanding the fact that voting is new to women, while the men have been schooled to it through generations. The total registration in Los Angeles, qualified for the municipal election, was 171,025. The number of men registered was 87,186, or 56.9 per cent of the total. The registration of women footed up 73,839, or 43.1 per cent of the total.

The total vote was 89,831—only 52.5 per cent of the registration.

The vote by men was 52,731.

The vote by women was 37,100.

The percentage of registered men voting was 54.2.

The percentage of registered women voting was 50.2.

The percentage of the total vote cast by men was 58.7.

The percentage of the total vote cast by women was 41.3.

From these figures it will be seen that the women did their duty as citizens just about as well as did the men, and perhaps, all things considered, a little better.

For the benefit of those who like to make deductions we present herewith a table, classified into well-defined districts or sections of the city, showing the way the vote was cast and the percentage made by women voters. A study of this table will prove interesting and instructive.

As a key for the guidance of readers not familiar with the city of Los Angeles, it may be stated that Hollywood, Westlake, Wilshire, and West Adams are rated as the so-called "exclusive" sections, while the Highland district is also populated largely by people of the leisure class. In the other sections the population runs largely to people of smaller means and humbler social station.

With this as a basis, you may entertain yourself for an entire evening with the figures in the table.

Here is an interesting comparison, in addition, drawn from precinct returns. In precinct 31, at Macy and Avila Streets, 144 men and 31 women voted. In precinct 32, at Amelia and Jackson Streets, 138 men and 14 women voted. In precinct 33, on North Los Angeles Street, 169 men and 6 women voted. Socially rated, these are among the humblest precincts in the city.

Now take two of the "exclusive" precincts: 451, which includes Chester Place and St. James Park, 61 men and 79 women; 427, at 1627 West Seventh Street, 90 men and 105 women. A conservative precinct like 79, on West Temple Street, showed as follows: 96 men and 112 women. At Wilmington, precinct 280, 55 of the 63 registered women voted.

Table showing how men and women voted.

Location.	Vote cast.	Men vote.	Women vote.	Women, percentage.
10 precincts in Highland.....	3,060	1,556	1,504	0.49
11 precincts in Hollywood.....	2,698	1,348	1,350	.50
17 precincts in Angeleno Heights.....	3,533	2,104	1,429	.40
21 precincts in East Side.....	5,281	3,154	2,127	.40
44 precincts in Boyle Heights.....	6,104	3,619	2,485	.41
84 precincts in Down Town and Industrial.....	15,734	10,907	4,827	.31
24 precincts in Westlake.....	7,768	4,201	3,567	.46
8 precincts in Edendale.....	2,324	1,313	1,011	.43
28 precincts in Wilshire Northwest.....	6,685	3,706	3,079	.46
61 precincts in West Adams.....	12,288	7,458	5,842	.47
64 precincts in Southwest.....	11,647	6,551	5,096	.44
69 precincts in Southeast.....	11,679	7,290	4,389	.38
14 precincts in Wilmington-San Pedro.....	2,113	1,420	693	.32
Total	89,831	52,731	37,100

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I take pleasure in presenting the petition of the women of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I present to the Senate a petition signed by a large number of citizens of the United States urging the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1, extending the right of suffrage to women, the joint resolution being upon the calendar, accompanied by Report No. 64, and I embrace this opportunity to make the following observations:

"Government is simply a tool in the hands of the people for the fashioning of that people's civilization." Government is strong or weak, capable or deficient, according to the people who control and make up that government. In this Republic the people constitute the Government. They are its creators and its maintenance; they are the Government. That the granting of the elective franchise to women would add to the strength, efficiency, justice, and fairness of government I have not the slightest doubt, and this is especially true in the United States, where all power is reposed in the people, with universal suffrage as the primal basis of its exercise. "The people" includes women, who can not be denied those political rights and responsibilities which men claim and assert for themselves without doing violence to the fundamental principles of our Government.

In this Republic we are in constant warfare against fraud and violence, avarice and cupidity, and in behalf of liberty and justice, whose success will be accelerated by extending the franchise to women, a class of voters which looks to all laws and movements as to how such laws and movements will affect her children; how such laws and conditions will promote morals, human health, and human progress more especially than as to how this or that particular law or polity will develop or serve material or property interests. In other words, as has been said, "Man looks after the affairs of life, but woman looks after life itself."

Woman's sphere, her ideals and her duties, make her the inescapable and essential conservator of human life, charged as she is with the duty of conserving the human race; and it is in harmony with political and natural justice to accord to her the right to say what laws shall assist her in bringing about the betterment of economic conditions.

I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Arizona will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present sundry petitions signed by women of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in favor of the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting votes to women, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I present petitions signed by several hundred men and women of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1, granting the right of suffrage to women. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to present numerous petitions signed by women of Ohio, favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment extending the right of suffrage to women. I ask that the petitions be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was surprised a moment ago to be summoned to the corridor to meet a delegation of ladies who recently have made a tour of the New England States, conferring with the governors of the several States and securing names to petitions in favor of the constitutional amendment which has been reported to the Senate. I take great pleasure in presenting these petitions, many of the signers being citizens of New Hampshire, and I will say a word regarding my own attitude on the subject.

For almost 50 years I have believed in woman suffrage. Long ago I asked myself the question: "Why should not a woman vote, provided she has the qualifications for suffrage that are required of men?" and I have never received a satisfactory answer to the question. The simple truth is that woman is not allowed to vote simply and solely because man says she shall not be allowed to do so. That is all there is to it as a fundamental proposition.

I have long believed that woman suffrage is inevitable in my own State, throughout the United States, and in the other civilized countries of the world. I hold to that conviction to-day. Forty years ago, in the New Hampshire Legislature, it was my privilege, as chairman of a special committee, to report a bill in favor of granting school suffrage to the women of my State. It became a law, and the women have exercised that right since, to the great advantage of our schools. They are now asking for wider opportunities to participate in public affairs, and, beyond a question, those wider opportunities in due time will be granted to them.

I do not expect, when that time comes, that the political millennium will arrive, or the social millennium, but I have every conviction that it will work for the benefit of society and for the benefit of our political institutions. Holding those views, it is but natural that I should cheerfully respond to the request that has been made of me and present to the Senate of the United States the petitions that lie on my desk, with a further suggestion that when the resolution that has been reported by the Committee on Woman Suffrage comes before the Senate it will give me great pleasure to vote in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment. I ask that the petitions be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not my intention, Mr. President, to detain the Senate with a discussion of the merits of the joint resolution. I can not let the occasion go by, however, without taking advantage of it to publicly express my approval of the resolution and to say in a very few words what I understand to be the basic principles upon which it is founded.

This movement for woman suffrage is a part of the general tendency of the age toward enlarging the participation of the people in the Government. It is also a part of the age-long rise of women from the state of servility and subjection which they formerly occupied in domestic as well as in political affairs.

I should imagine that it would be more difficult, considering this proposition as an original one and from a universal view, for anyone to state a reason why the right to vote should be a question of sex than to state reasons why women who are otherwise qualified should have the right to vote. In other words, it is difficult to conceive of a valid or logical objection to the proposition.

I suppose that the exclusive privilege now given in some States to the male citizens to take part in the elective franchise is based upon superior physical strength. I think we have arrived at a day and age when it is universally conceded that that is not a high nor a just principle upon which to base the privilege of the franchise. If it were, then we should pick out those who are physically the strongest and give them superior rights in the State.

In the case of a man like Jack Johnson, who at one time was the champion prize fighter in the world, if the highest privilege, the highest right, which a citizen can enjoy is to be based upon physical superiority, I suppose he would stand very high in the favors of the State.

I read a document which defaced the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here a few days ago—and which gives intrinsic evidence that it is the production of a perverted mind—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to state to the Senator from Washington that that matter has been expunged from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that it has been expunged from the RECORD, but I nevertheless may refer to it,

because it was printed in the RECORD, and I have it before me now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair made the observation only through fear that the Senator was not present and was not aware of the action the Senate had taken.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is an attack upon the proposition that women should have the franchise, and yet I read in this article directed against equal suffrage this statement:

In brute force, in all that constitutes the mere animal frame and nature, women are inferior to men; but in purity of mind, in refinement of sentiment, in all that most nearly assimilates our race to the good angels above, they are superior to men.

Yet the writer of the article who entertained those views is of the opinion that those qualities which he compares to the Divine Being's above are not of a sufficiently high order to be a test of the right to vote.

Mr. President, it is objected that the National Government, the Congress of the United States, should not interfere, but that this matter should be left to the action of the States. I find, however, in the Constitution of the United States already a list enumerated of the rights of citizens. They are guaranteed in the Constitution—a privilege which attaches not only to citizens but to every person—protection against unreasonable seizures and searches. They are guaranteed due process of law and protected in the right to own property, given the right of trial by jury, insured the privilege of free speech and of a free press. If those privileges were of sufficient importance, and they undoubtedly were, to be embodied in the Bill of Rights and placed in the Constitution of the United States, that privilege which is of a still higher order, namely, the right to participate in the primary functions of government, is also not only of sufficient importance but is appropriate to be protected in the Constitution itself.

Every woman born or naturalized in the United States, by the terms of this Constitution, is a citizen of the United States. In view of her intellectual attainments, her moral character, her ability to comply in every respect with those tests of fitness for the franchise which are applied to men, a consideration in justice and fairness of her status and duties as a citizen entitle her to the same prerogative.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution guarantees to every citizen the privileges and immunities of citizenship and enjoins any State from abridging or denying them. The writing of one additional word into the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution, the addition of a word of one syllable to this Constitution, would accomplish throughout the Nation the great object for which this movement has been instituted and carried on with so much perseverance.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution, and I submit certain petitions in its support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a petition in support of the joint resolution under discussion, handed to me by Miss Laura S. Runyon, a teacher of history in the Warrensburg Normal School, of my State, one of several great institutions of that character of a highly cultivated and most excellent nature.

These petitions favor the adoption of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, and I take pleasure in presenting them. I ask that the petitions be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I present a petition, very largely signed by women of Virginia, asking for the passage of the joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States so as to give the right of suffrage to the women of the country. I ask that the petition be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BACON. I present sundry petitions from women of Georgia on the same subject, which I ask may be likewise referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Georgia will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a number of petitions signed by citizens of Texas in favor of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SWANSON. In behalf of some ladies and at their request I present petitions signed by sundry citizens of Virginia in favor of the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to present a petition, signed by numerous ladies of Georgia, in behalf of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to present, in behalf of the women of Kentucky, a petition in favor of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I present a petition on the same subject, signed by citizens of Maine, and in the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] I present in his behalf a like petition. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I present a similar petition, signed by a large number of women of my State, in favor of the adoption of Senate resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. MYERS. I present a petition signed by a large number of citizens of Montana on the same subject. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the sentiment favorable to woman suffrage is not very strong in Mississippi, but there are some very excellent women in that State and a few men who are very earnestly for the measure. I take pleasure in presenting their petitions to the Senate, and I ask that they be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. At the request of Vermont ladies present this morning I beg leave to present a petition in favor of the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

I ought to say in this connection that, while I have not received from the State a formal petition to be presented upon this occasion, I have had numerous letters from representative people of the State requesting action on my part favorable to this movement. I only say this because had I known that the matter was coming up this morning I would have brought the letters with me and presented them as a part of the representation to the Senate of the United States. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Vermont will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. KENYON. On the same subject I present sundry petitions signed by citizens of the State of Iowa. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WEEKS. I present resolutions and indorsements upon the same subject. I think I ought to say that the large number of petitions which I hold in my hand has been the result of public meetings held at different towns and cities of Massachusetts. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present sundry petitions of a like character with those already presented. I do not content myself with merely the idle presentation on my part of those petitions. They are signed by citizens of the United States. They are not voters of the United States because of certain constitutional limitations. The first line I read in the Federal Charter is—

We, the people of the United States.

The women of this country are not in a governmental sense any part of the "people" of the United States at this time, unless in those States or jurisdictions where by State legislation or by constitutional provision that right has been guaranteed to them.

Mr. President, there are in round numbers about 100,000,000 human beings in this Republic at this time. The potential vote

in November, 1912, of its male citizens was 22,000,000. Of that 22,000,000, 15,000,000 saw fit to exercise the right conferred by the laws of their country; 7,000,000 were busy, disabled, sick, or unable to get into the returns for various reasons. One-third of the male lords of creation, now by the laws of the country given the right of self-government, voluntarily absented themselves from the polls last November.

It is said that women will not and do not vote when the right is extended to them. Neither do nor will the men in any larger proportion. Therefore I am moved to say that the appreciation of the responsibilities imposed by the right to vote will be as thoroughly felt by the women of this country as by the men who now have and in part exercise that right.

Mr. President, the law of physical force ought not to be an argument on this joint resolution. We hope that the human race is traveling toward a better age; that the days of armaments on land and sea will cease; that it will no longer be a question of battleships and military force; that it will be a question of right and wrong. I hope that we are rapidly traveling toward that time when justice will sit enthroned in the human heart as the supreme arbiter between nations and between men.

In that age, however far distant it may be, the influence and the vote of womankind will be as powerful as that of men. Men themselves have only been enfranchised as the result of many struggles in the centuries past. Who has forgotten the charter fights in England? Who has forgotten the fights in the earlier history of the older States of this Republic? Only by degrees have the limitations of property qualifications to vote been stricken off year after year. Only here and there we can remember the time when constitutional restrictions, when the limitations upon the right of men to vote, were removed by the great impulsive movements that came from those who felt that the sense of justice no longer permitted those limitations.

So the history of the right for us to vote, my fellow men, has been checkered by the vicissitudes of the slow-moving progress of humanity.

Women now vote in many of the States. In the third largest State in the Union, with a vote cast of more than 1,200,000 last November, a limited right of suffrage has been granted by an act of our general assembly. By that statute women are given the right to vote for candidates for all public offices except those created and existing by virtue of the State constitution. It is a partial advance, but it is no more partial than the advance that has been made in every State and in every country where the English tongue is spoken. Wherever the common law of the mother country has been practiced, wherever the personal and the property rights of women have been subject to the common law, we have seen the gradual advance of womankind from the condition of marital serfdom and economic vassalage until she has advanced to the full panoply of property rights, holding her individual estate or community property according to the laws of the several States granting to her her personal rights.

At one time woman upon entering into the state of matrimony lost her personal identity, and at the same time the possession as well as the title of all her property was vested in her husband. The husband was the absolute proprietary lord of her means. That was the common law of our English ancestors. I do not wonder that sometimes even now man thinks this is an innovation. He is almost like a Mohammedan. The Koran tells us that every reform is an innovation, every innovation is an error, and every error leads to hell-fire. If that is so, we who favor this joint resolution are headed for a warmer country than Washington. [Laughter.] I am going to take a chance on it, Mr. President, because in the very nature of things, if womankind has had some of her limitations removed, and no injury has resulted in years past, we had as well take the other limitations off and make the opening words of the Constitution of this Republic a living, active, dynamic force in the great Republic of the Western Hemisphere.

It is said to me that woman does not want to vote, and that, besides, she is not a soldier. For my part, if I had lived in the days of the Civil War and had worn either a gray uniform or a blue I would rather have carried a Confederate or a Union musket than have been a woman who stayed at home and waited for news from the far line of battle or the hospital's wasting breath.

The bravest of battles that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men.

No marshaling troop, no bivouac song,
No banners that gleam and wave;
But, oh, its struggles they last so long,
From babyhood down to the grave.

Somebody has said to me, Mr. President, in private conversation on this question, that womankind will not improve politics. Well, if she does not, if she only keeps it from getting any worse, I am willing to take a chance on it.

If we and others who have, through ourselves or through our ancestors, for many years been engaged in the management of the dear public's affairs have made what we have of it, with investigation heaped upon investigation, with hill on hill and Alp on Alp arising, with which we are endeavoring to issue a certificate of moral character to ourselves—if we have not got any further along than that in some hundreds of years, for the Lord's sake let us give woman a chance and see if she can not get us on a little higher level than we now are.

What good will it do to increase merely the body of the electorate? That is what this is. The mere multiplication of units avails nothing unless the quality of the unit is improved. I believe woman is a better unit than man, though not possibly on the intricacies of the tariff schedules, not possibly in discussing the niceties of peanut oil or the solvency or insolvency of banks or the intricacy of currency bills and regional reserves. She will need a little preliminary drilling on those subjects, and I think some Senators will also have to have a little preliminary drilling before they are ready to vote. So it is an even score when we mark it upon the wall in that way.

Will it do any good? I think it will, Mr. President. Does not a woman protect her babe in the cradle? Is not her maternal instinct stronger than the instinct of the other parent? Does not she use all her efforts for that purpose? Do not her power, her intuition, her diplomacy, her arguments, and her imperial influence with man go to defend her own? They do.

For myself, if nothing else were at stake with me, if the woman has a right to defend with her life her honor, with her life her babe in the cradle, I would put the ballot in her hands in order that when the babe grows to be an adult she still might defend him on land and sea and wherever in the wide world he might be. Woman is infinitely the superior of man on moral questions. We are of coarser fiber; we think in lower terms. But the woman, enlisted in the cause of moral progress, will protect her babe in infancy and she will protect the same babe in the years when he is an adult. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in presenting a petition from many women who wish the Senate to vote in favor of Senate joint resolution No. 1 in regard to this matter. As a matter of fact, I have always believed in the right of women to vote. I do now believe in it, and I say "now" without equivocation and without any mental reservation.

Women vote in Oregon, and the last city election in Portland was, I am told, decided by the votes of the women. In my family there are four persons—my wife, two daughters, and myself. They and I are registered voters. As a matter of fact, my sympathy is with the women. I have always done all I could to secure to them the right of suffrage, and have labored with others in Oregon until finally we now have the women as full voters in every election.

Several arguments in favor of woman suffrage have been presented here, but there are many things not usually presented in relation to this question which appeal to me. I am by profession not a lawyer; I am a physician; and probably I look naturally upon this question from the standpoint of a physician. As a matter of fact, it is not true that men have greater physical endurance than women. Women can stand and, as a rule, do stand more pain than the bravest and most courageous man is able to endure.

I have never known any reason why women should not vote. They are our full partners in all of the affairs of life. From the hour in which we are born until the day on which we die they accompany us through all our lives in every circumstance. We can not do without them, and we do not wish to. There is no reason on earth why they should not participate with us in all of the joys and privileges of life, as they do now in our sorrows and adversities.

There is no reason for denying, and I can not understand why anyone should deny, women a right to vote, if the women wish to vote. If a woman does not wish to vote, that is a different matter. Under the joint resolution, if enacted into law, if she does not wish to vote, she does not have to do so. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] has pointed out, many men decline to vote, and women have a perfect right to decline if they so desire; but those women who do wish to vote should be allowed to do so.

The interest of women in good and bad legislation is as great as is ours. Good legislation and properly conducted government go right into the homes of the families of this country and bear

directly upon the happiness, the fate, and the fortunes of the family, including the women. The woman is more interested in her offspring than is the male. Naturally it will be to her interest to have in the country good government, sound government, government which will protect the home and which will protect and promote the health and the happiness of her offspring. It is her desire that her offspring shall be happy; that they shall be prosperous and healthy. Men have not as much interest in the welfare of their offspring. Quite naturally, then, and logically, woman should have a voice and a share in saying what manner of government should be placed upon herself and her children. I do not see how anyone can question the logic of that statement. As I have said before, I have for that reason at all times been in favor of women voting. I have gotten over the idea that women would not vote as intelligently as men. Women may make mistakes if they get the right to vote. We make many of them. If women do not make more mistakes than we do they are going to do very well, indeed. It is not within the realm of possibility that women can make more mistakes than we do, and if they do they have a right to make them and then correct them afterwards, if they care to do so. I hope and trust, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will pass. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I present a number of petitions, numerous signed by some of the best people of the State of Indiana, both men and women, praying for the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. PENROSE. I present petitions signed by over 10,000 prominent and leading citizens of Pennsylvania in favor of the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. COLT. I present several petitions from women of Rhode Island in favor of the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1, relating to woman suffrage. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. RANDELL. I present petitions, signed by a number of male residents of Louisiana, urging the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1, giving the right of suffrage to women. I desire to say that I am in favor of the joint resolution, and shall do what I can to secure its adoption. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, at the request and in behalf of certain ladies in the State of Louisiana, I wish to present a petition in favor of the female suffrage amendment now pending before this body. In doing so, I wish to say that I am opposed to the passage of that proposed amendment to the Constitution, because the effect of its passage will be to take away from my State the constitutional right which she now enjoys in that respect. I have not the slightest objection to other States conferring the right of suffrage on women in their States if they so desire; but I am unalterably opposed to other States forcing the State of Louisiana to do so, whether that State wishes to do so or not; and I will do everything I can honorably do to prevent the passage of the proposed amendment. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to inform the Senate that the resolutions handed me by ladies of Illinois I have taken the liberty to leave with the filing clerk of the Senate. I respectfully inform the Senate that I present those resolutions in behalf of the ladies of Illinois and of the delegation that represented them who are here visiting in Washington. I ask that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I desire to present several petitions signed by ladies in my State on the same subject. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I represent in part the State of Wyoming, which 44 years ago, as a Territory, adopted equal suffrage and equal rights and privileges for men and women. That has been the law since, and it has been accepted and supported by all parties. When, some twenty-odd years ago, after having lived under that law for over 20 years, the Territory of Wyoming knocked at the doors of Congress for admittance into the Union she had in her constitution the provision for equal suffrage. In the constitutional convention of the new State, composed of about 80 delegates of all parties, but 3 recorded their votes against the provision.

I do not at this time present any petition, but I simply give the record of that State. The law is universally respected and indorsed, and if I occupied hours of time I could not say too much in its favor.

It is true that a large number of the people in Wyoming believe it is unnecessary to have a constitutional provision or amendment, because each State could settle the matter for itself. I myself have formerly, while a member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, reported in favor of such an amendment as proposed in these petitions, and personally I should take pleasure in supporting such an amendment, though I find no fault with those who believe otherwise and think each State should settle it for itself.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of a very few of the good women of the State of Alabama I present a petition favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I shall vote against the passage of the joint resolution. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I take pleasure in presenting a petition, signed by the people of my State, in favor of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I send to the desk a letter received this morning from the governor of our State, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Lansing, July 28, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I am writing an exact duplicate of this letter to Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND. I must confess that I am not familiar with just what is pending in relation to the proposed amendment to the National Constitution granting suffrage to women. If such a bill is pending and is due to come up for approval or disapproval, I am quite willing that you should know my feelings in regard to granting suffrage to women. I favor such an amendment, not because the right of suffrage to women would reform the United States in 30 days, but because I believe they are entitled to the right and privilege of suffrage. On that basis I am hoping that you will hold a similar opinion and vote accordingly. After all, I am not writing this letter by way of instruction, but in order to express to you my own wishes. It is not necessary for me to write pages on this subject, because I have stated my reason for supporting the right of suffrage to women in one sentence. With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

WOODBIDGE N. FERRIS, Governor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I voted for the constitutional amendment in the State of Michigan last year. I shall vote for it here when I have an opportunity.

I presume few, if any, Senators here have had the distinguished honor which I have personally enjoyed of accompanying my mother to the polls as a full-fledged voter in the State of California. I did not feel that the dignity of the American people or the strength and perpetuity of the Republic were endangered by that course. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Michigan will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President, at the request of one lady I am presenting a petition signed by 13 ladies of the city of Washington, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, at the request of a lady from my State I am presenting a petition in favor of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

I find that in the petition there is no signature from the State of South Carolina. I am presenting the petition as a matter of courtesy to the lady from my State who handed it to me. I am not in a position to state just what is the sentiment of the people of my State in reference to the joint resolution

until I hear from them, as we generally do on subjects in which they are interested.

I think this explanation is necessary to show that there is not on the petition any signature from my State. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have the honor to present, on behalf of the women of Nevada, petitions in support of the joint resolution.

While I do not intend to make any argument in support of it, as I do not believe it is required, and because there are others who can more ably discuss the matter, I can not refrain from stating that the men of my State believe women should have the right to vote. We realize that the purification of the administration of our Government is the most important question before the people to-day. We believe that the absolute and unrestricted enfranchisement of women will do more to purify our Government than all of the corrupt-practices bills that can be enacted into law.

On two separate occasions the legislature of my State has passed almost unanimously a resolution amending the constitution so as to grant to women the unrestricted and absolute franchise in the State. I feel that I am able to say that at the next election the men of the State will almost unanimously confirm the action of the legislature. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have the honor of presenting petitions in behalf of the proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States.

I do not care at this time to say more than that I am in hearty sympathy with the joint resolution. I have so expressed myself on very many occasions. While there is a great difference of opinion in the State of Michigan as to whether or not women should vote, I here and now protest against the statements which have been given circulation to the effect that only women of the most undesirable classes are favoring woman suffrage. So far as Michigan is concerned, this is grossly incorrect. I know that many of the very best mothers and wives of my State are in hearty sympathy with this movement. Believing, as I do, that woman should have the same political rights as man, I shall cheerfully do what I can to secure such rights for her. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I take pleasure in presenting petitions from numerous intelligent and accomplished ladies of the State of Kansas asking me to support the suffrage amendment; and I take this occasion to say a few words in behalf of the amendment.

Kansas is the infant State in the suffrage movement. While we have had woman suffrage in one form or another in educational and municipal affairs perhaps longer than most of the States, we have had complete woman suffrage, equal suffrage, only since the last general election.

Last year the Kansas women modestly, but earnestly, without flourish of trumpets, asked the men to grant them this right, and we generously responded by a most decisive vote.

No nobler women, no more devoted wives, or more loving mothers, and no better housekeepers can be found anywhere on earth, and we have no fears of their losing these excellent qualities by extending that which of right belongs to them. I congratulate them upon their splendid victory and heartily welcome them into their new field of labor. The temperance question, always alive in my State, and all other moral questions are now perfectly safe and secure in the hands of the voters for the first time in the history of the State.

I have always favored woman suffrage because I believe that under the Constitution of the United States, and under the fundamental laws, woman is justly and legally entitled to it. I look at it as much from a legal standpoint as from any other, although from a moral standpoint it can be urged with even greater force.

In this connection I desire to read a few sections from the Constitution of the United States bearing out this contention.

Section 2 of Article IV provides:

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The fourteenth amendment provides:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the

State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The fifteenth amendment provides:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

It will hardly be argued by anyone that women are not citizens. If they are admitted to be citizens, their legal right to vote is already clearly established by law.

While I believe no constitutional amendment is really necessary to give the right of equal suffrage, yet if it will aid in any way to bring about equal suffrage throughout the United States I am certainly in favor of the proposed amendment. The only reason we have not enjoyed woman suffrage throughout the United States is because the men have originally assumed the right and the power to deprive the women of this legal right of suffrage. In the early days the men in my State, who perhaps were not then as just and chivalrous as they are in this day, met and framed the constitution of the State. In doing so, while under the Constitution of the United States the women were equal citizens with them, they deprived them of their most sacred right of citizenship, that of voting.

I have often wondered what the result would have been had the women assumed this right and met and framed the constitution of Kansas, and deprived the men of the right to vote. I feel that the men judges of the various courts would have held long ago that such action would have been unconstitutional. So if it would have been unconstitutional for the women to have framed the constitution of Kansas and to have deprived the men of the right to vote, I say it is unconstitutional for the men to have met and denied the women of this right and privilege. To use a rather homely, but forcible, familiar expression: "What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander." If it would have been unconstitutional for the women to have done this, it was also unconstitutional for the men. I believe that under the fundamental law of this land and under the highest authority we have—the Constitution of the United States—they are legally entitled to vote, and should not longer be deprived of that right by the men.

I shall gladly support the constitutional amendment, and hope later to take more time to discuss the question from a moral standpoint, whereby it will secure equal justice, nobler purposes, better government, and the highest and purest citizenship. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in presenting these petitions of the women of Oklahoma, asking for the adoption of the Senate joint resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women on the same basis as the suffrage enjoyed by men, I do so in no mere perfunctory way, because personally I strongly favor the proposed extension of the franchise. I believe that it will be better for the Government of the United States, better for State government, better for county government, better for city government, better for the home, better for the safeguarding of the health of the people, better for the safeguarding of the rights, interests, happiness, and general welfare of the children, of the women, and of the men that the women of the Nation should have a right to register their wishes with regard to government upon an equal basis with men.

The reasons for this request on the part of the women in the country are overwhelmingly unanswerable, and the time has come when they must be considered with dignity, with unbiased minds, free from prejudice or passion, in the interest of the welfare of the human race.

What are these reasons? They have been succinctly set forth in the memorial which I had the honor to present (S. Doc. 519, 61st Cong., 2d sess.) and which I had the honor, as a friend of this cause, upon the counsel and advice of the women representing the National American Woman Suffrage Association, to prepare:

First. The women of the United States are citizens of the United States, entitled by nature to an equal right to enjoy the opportunities of life.

Second. They perform half the work of the United States.

Third. They bear all the children of the United States.

Fourth. They educate these children.

Fifth. They inculcate in these children lessons of morality, of religion, of industry, of civic righteousness, and of civic duty.

Sixth. They deserve to be honored by the children of the country as equal to men in dignity and honor.

Seventh. They pay half the taxes of the United States.

Eighth. They possess half of the property of the United States, or, at least, they are entitled to possess half of the property of the United States by virtue of labor performed and duty well done.

Their property and their right to liberty and to life are subject to law. The law controls the property as well as the rights of the women to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and therefore women should have the right to a voice in the election of Representatives to write the statutes and to execute them.

Mr. President, I do not understand how a man, loving and honoring women, believing in their intelligence and integrity of mind, believing in their moral and ethical sense, believing in their upright character, believing in their right as human beings, can deny these overwhelming reasons justifying suffrage or offer them a Barmecide feast of empty gallantry while denying them the solid food of actual power.

I do not understand how any man, in the presence of God, can deny the validity of these reasons. If you attempt to answer these sound reasons with a sensitive conscience, it seems to me you are compelled to yield to the righteous demand of the women of America.

You well know, as students of history and as students of statecraft, that the right to the ballot is the right protective of every other right, and, knowing this, how will you thus deny women equal opportunity to earn equal wages for equal labor and to protect their own lives and that of their children by the ballot?

Will you suggest that good women will not vote and bad women will vote? This most untrue and unkind suggestion has been emphatically and finally answered by history, which demonstrates that the same percentage of women vote as men, and that the vote of undesirable women is an utterly negligible quantity; that women are not to be regarded as bringing to suffrage a preponderance of evil, but that their vote has brought to the State an important influence in the interest and well-being of children, new and stronger laws for the protection and advancement of the interests of mothers and of girls, new and better laws for the preservation of the public health, new and better laws for decency in administering and beautifying cities, and more worthy candidates by all parties are offered where women vote.

The right of suffrage is justified by every natural right; can not be denied by conscientious, thoughtful, studious men who desire to deal justly with all human beings alike. I greatly desire to see these rights established in order to raise in dignity and power the mothers of this Nation.

No nation ever rises higher than the motherhood of the nation; and the welfare of the Nation is not promoted by denying to the mothers of the Nation the elementary right of suffrage which is essential not only to protect their own rights of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, but especially to enable them better to protect their children, the children of the Nation—the boys and girls—who must have charge in a few years of this great Republic. The children of the Nation are taught by women their manners, their morals, and their standards of life, their ambitions, their industry; their good qualities are stimulated by women far more than by men. Women should have the right to protect their children "from the treacherous pitfalls which lie in the pathway of life"; to protect their children against disease and insanitary conditions; to protect their children against the liquor traffic; to protect their children against the brothel; and in protecting their children they will protect as well the men of the Nation and establish in their hearts higher and better standards.

The whole world is beginning to realize the enormous importance of giving greater power to women. Many of our own States have given full suffrage to women within the last few years, including Oregon, Arizona, Kansas, California, Alaska, Washington; and Wyoming, Idaho, Colorado, and Utah have long given women full suffrage with beneficial results to the school system, and to the charities of the State, to better conditions protecting the lives of the women and children of those States, and no just objection has been found against it where it has been exercised. Full suffrage has been given by many other great self-governing, highly civilized communities, as South Australia, Western Australia, Australia itself, New South Wales, Tasmania, Queensland, New Zealand, and Finland. Illinois has recently extended suffrage on a large scale, and I want to register my earnest hope that the Senate of the United States will recognize its great obligation to the human race in extending

this measure of justice to the women of America, so that this great Republic may reach the highest ideals of Christian civilization.

I will not appeal to men from a party standpoint or call their attention to the effect which may be expected to follow if either one of the great parties should go so far as to offend the nearly 4,000,000 women who now have the full suffrage in America by contemptuously denying a right so obviously just and so obviously necessary to the welfare, to the progress, and to the happiness of the people of America, but I will remind you that many great groups of men, such as the Farmers' Union, the National Grange, the American Federation of Labor, the Labor Party, the Socialist Party, the last with over 648,000 votes, have declared for this progressive movement; and I remind you also that a great party, with high ideals, casting over 4,000,000 votes last year, has declared for woman suffrage, and that this question can no longer be ignored.

I congratulate the Senate and the country that 22 Senators have to-day publicly expressed their favorable opinion of this reform.

During the delivery of Mr. OWEN'S speech,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour has expired, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the Senator from Oklahoma has concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oklahoma will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. OWEN'S speech,

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator from North Carolina will yield, I think an explanation is due relative to the petition handed in by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who stated that the petition was not signed by residents or women of his own State.

These petitions were brought here this morning, and the petitioners were met at Hyattsville. In the short time it was impossible to place all the petitions in the hands of the Senators from the particular States. An effort was made there as far as possible to give to each Senator the petitions of his own State, but in the hurry and confusion it was impossible to make the distribution complete.

I have no doubt the Senator will find upon examining the petitions filed with the Senate that there are petitions signed by women of his own State.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from North Carolina will allow the unfinished business to be laid aside until the rest of the petitions have been presented.

Mr. SIMMONS. I assume that very little more time will be required upon this matter, and trusting that Senators will recognize the fact that two Senators have given notice that they will speak to-day on the unfinished business and will abridge their comments as much as possible. I now ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside until all the petitions are presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present several petitions of constituents of mine in the State of Connecticut in behalf of Senate joint resolution No. 1, and ask that they be properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I present petitions signed by many estimable ladies from the State of Delaware in favor of the woman-suffrage joint resolution which I ask may be properly referred. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. STONE. I presented some petitions from women in favor of the amendment relating to suffrage this morning. I have now in my hand some petitions sent to my colleague [Mr. REED], who is not present in the Chamber, being absent on official business. In his behalf I present the petitions. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I send to the desk certain petitions which have been received from women of Arkansas on the same general subject. I ask that they take the usual course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk six several petitions favoring the adoption of the constitutional amendment. They are variously signed by citizens of different localities. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Wyoming will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CHILTON. On behalf of some citizens of West Virginia, I present a petition favoring the adoption of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire also to present in behalf of my colleague [Mr. GOFF], who is necessarily absent, certain petitions on the same subject. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SHIELDS. I present a petition signed by many splendid women of Tennessee in support of Senate joint resolution No. 1. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition of the Senator from Tennessee will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have the privilege of presenting some petitions signed by some of the splendid women and men of Ohio in support of the proposed amendment to the Constitution. In doing this I desire to say that at the last constitutional election in the State of Ohio I voted in favor of the amendment granting the right of suffrage to women. It failed by a very substantial vote. If the opportunity presents itself to vote for an amendment to the Ohio constitution on this subject, granting the right of suffrage to women, I shall vote for it again.

I have never had any sympathy with the stock arguments which are used in opposition to woman suffrage, but at the same time, while on my feet, I desire very briefly to present my views upon this subject.

Many people when they discuss the subject refer to suffrage as a privilege, and in one sense of the word it is a privilege. Others speak of it as a right, and in one sense of the word it is a right when it is bestowed. But I have never looked upon the right of suffrage so much as a privilege or a right as I look upon it as a solemn duty. When we speak of the right of suffrage as enjoyed by men, I prefer to look upon it as a duty which American manhood owes to our country, and instead of granting the privilege to vote, if it were in my power, to any class of our citizens who are given the right, I would make it a duty, and I would penalize those who did not perform the duty.

That leads me to this suggestion, and I suggest it rather in the interest of woman suffrage than against it: In the State of Ohio, for instance, it has not yet appeared that the majority of the women there want to vote. I wish they did want to vote; and, if I may be pardoned the suggestion, it seems to me that the very minute the majority of the women of any State show to the men of that State that they want the right to vote they will speedily be given the right to vote.

And that leads to this thought: It has not yet appeared that the women of Ohio or the majority of them want to vote. In some of the Western States it appears that they do want to vote; and in some of the States, as has been suggested by several Senators on the floor to-day, there is no general sentiment in favor of woman suffrage. The question therefore is, Shall the men and women of a State who want to vote have the right to confer upon the women of a State who do not want to vote that privilege or duty, whichever we may call it? And, on the other hand, if the women of a State do not want to vote, should they have the right to prevent the women of another State from voting if they want to vote?

With this thought in mind, and with the hope that the women of the country may some time in the near future have the right to vote if they want to vote, permit me to suggest that the first step in this campaign should be to teach the women to want to vote, and after they have been taught to want to vote the right will be given. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I present petitions favoring woman suffrage signed by many of the most estimable women of my State and home town. Whatever may be my

personal view on this matter, I would be a veritable coward did I not present the petitions. I believe in the right and privilege of petition. Personally, I am frank to say, with admiration and love for woman not surpassed by any man in this Chamber or elsewhere on God's footstool, I believe it would not tend to enhance or advance the well-being of women, nor do I believe it would accrue to the well-being of this beloved land of ours.

I present these petitions, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, these petitions, also from my Commonwealth, were handed to me by citizens of my State asking that they might be given to my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] to present. They said that in the event he was not here in time to present them they wished that I would present them. So at their request and in the name of my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] I present them. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SIMMONS. In behalf of a number of most excellent women of the State of North Carolina I present a petition in favor of woman suffrage. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from North Carolina will be received and referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. McLEAN. I present sundry petitions signed by a large number of women in the State which I have the honor in part to represent. I ask for their proper reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present petitions, numerous signed by citizens of Wisconsin, in favor of the joint resolution for a constitutional amendment extending suffrage to women, and on behalf of my colleague [Mr. STEPHENSON], who is unavoidably absent, like petitions addressed to him for presentation on this occasion.

At this time, Mr. President, with the business of legislation immediately in hand pressing upon us, I shall not take the time of the Senate for more than a word. But I believe that it will be helpful for the passage of the joint resolution when it comes up regularly for consideration in this body for Senators now to declare their position upon this question.

I can not remember a time, Mr. President, when I was not in favor of extending the suffrage to women. I have always believed in coeducation, as I have always believed in coeducation, equality of property rights, and, in short, sir, equality of opportunity for men and women alike; that civilization is best and most advanced where men and women cooperate and mutually respect each other; that democracy is safest where its entire citizenship is most enlightened, most interested, most alert. If the ballot educates men in citizenship and is a source of power and protection to them, surely it is of equal value to women.

Government is organized, Mr. President, for the good of society; and the very basis and foundation of all organized society is the home. Every act of government reacts for good or evil upon the home. The tariff now under consideration, the laws regulating trusts, the statutes for the control and regulation of banking and currency, the laws regulating interstate transportation, and all legislation of like character strikes directly at the home life, because it bears directly upon the cost of living and the ability to maintain the home. The women of this country are as directly interested in everything pertaining to the economies of government and of the home as are the men. They understand it as well as do the men, and their potential influence, even when handicapped by the denial of the right of suffrage, has been felt in the Halls of Congress. The long struggle to write upon the statute books legislation protecting the home and the life of the family against the adulteration of food products would have been going on to this hour except for the organized effort the women of the country put back of that great reform movement.

And, so, Mr. President, just as it is essential that we should have the cooperation of the women of the country in the development of the home life, so we should have the cooperation of the women of the country in the legislation which underlies the home life and is foundational to all our social relations.

At another time, when it will more directly bear upon the passage of the joint resolution extending suffrage to women, I shall address the Senate in support of that resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. GRONNA. I present petitions numerous signed by citizens of North Dakota praying for the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

Mr. President, in my State the privilege of universal suffrage has not been extended, but I believe I may be permitted to say that the potential influence of women has been felt in that State to a degree or more so than it has in any other State. Ultimately this question will be settled by the States. I have confidence that the people of my State will, when that question is presented to them, settle it with the same courage and patriotism that other questions of reform and progress have been settled.

When the question comes up for a vote in the Senate, I will give to it the same consideration that I give to other questions. I am here as a servant of the people of my State. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I also present, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER], who is necessarily absent, due to illness in his family, another petition. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate with any extended remarks.

I will say that on two former occasions the people of my State voted upon the question of granting suffrage to women. The proposition was defeated both times, but the sentiment in its favor has continued to grow steadily with the years, and it is now for the third time submitted in the form of a proposal to amend our constitution, and will be voted upon at the next general election.

I am satisfied that the measure will now carry. I am satisfied that the demand for it has grown so steadily and spread so widely throughout the State that many men upon reflection who were formerly opposed to it are now fully convinced that the principle of universal suffrage is right.

I have always voted for it. I have never believed that it would bring the millennium or work any great revolution, but I have always voted for it because I have felt that, as a principle of absolute justice, it is unfair to withhold it from intelligent women who ask for such a right upon the ground that it is a protective one, helpful to them. I shall support it again in my State, and I have no hesitation in frankly saying that I shall vote for it here.

I present a petition, not a large one, from a number of intelligent men and women of my State asking for the adoption of the joint resolution. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions signed by a large number of citizens of California, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented petitions of 40,000 members of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, of 75 members of the Socialist Party of Ogden, Utah, and of sundry citizens of the State of Utah, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BRYAN presented petitions signed by a large number of women of the State of Florida, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions signed by a large number of citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. OWEN (for Mr. GORE) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to

the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. THOMAS (for Mr. O'GORMAN) presented petitions signed by a large number of citizens of the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. LODGE (for Mr. Root) presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition signed by Gelson Gardner, V. L. Stoddard, and a large number of citizens of the United States, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition signed by Daniel A. Hastings, Fred Larsen, and John W. Benson, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying that certain members of the Organized Militia of the State of Washington and certain sailors of the United States Navy who participated in the recent so-called riot in the city of Seattle be dishonorably discharged from the service, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Anacortes, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for dredging and improving Edison Slough, Skagit County, in the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WEEKS presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2784) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Williams, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2810) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Nicholls, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented memorials of sundry citizens of Takoma Park, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. STONE. From the Committee on Indian Affairs, I report back favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute the bill (S. 2711) to provide for the acquiring of station grounds by the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 92) thereon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there be, and hereby is, granted to the Great Northern Railway Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota, subject to and upon compliance by the company with all the provisions of the act of March 2, 1899, entitled "An act to provide for the acquiring of rights of way by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, Indian allotments, and for other purposes," and the acts amendatory thereto of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 330), and June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 859), and the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior thereunder, additional station grounds adjoining the right of way of the said railway company in the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, adjacent to the village of Okanogan, in the county of Okanogan, in the said State, and at the said railway company's station known as Chillovist, located in lots 4 and 6, section 1, township 32 north, range 25 east, Willamette meridian, in the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, to the extent of not to exceed 200 feet in width by a length of 3,000 feet for each of said station grounds: *Provided*, That if any of the lands to be acquired by the railway company under the provisions of this act shall have been tentatively selected by Indians as a part of their allotments they shall be entitled to receive, upon the approval of their allotments, the compensation for damages to said lands and improvements thereon paid by the said railway company: *And provided further*, That such station grounds are granted subject to the right of the United States to cross the same and the works constructed thereon with canals or water conduits of any kind, or with roadways, or with transmission lines for telephone, telegraph, or electric power, or with any other public improvements which may now or in the future be built by or under authority of the United States across such grounds; and the said company shall build and maintain at its own expense all structures that may be required at such crossing, and in accepting this grant shall release the United States from all damages which may result from the construction and use of such crossings, canals, conduits, transmission lines, and other improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 2860) providing a temporary method of conducting the nomination and election of United States Senators; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 2861) authorizing mineral entries on lands of the Spokane Indian Reservation, State of Washington, classified and reserved as timberlands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2862) for the condemnation of land in the interior of square No. 159, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2863) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 2864) granting an honorable discharge to William G. Lang;

A bill (S. 2865) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of David Houk; and

A bill (S. 2866) to correct the military record of William G. Lang (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2867) granting a pension to Martin Malone; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2868) granting an increase of pension to Lucy P. Wheeler (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2869) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Arnold (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

ELIZABETH T. BUTLER.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 145), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth T. Butler, widow of Maj. George Butler, late a member of the Capitol police of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ROCK CREEK BRIDGE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution that will not result in any debate and for which I ask present consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not make any objection to the resolution, but after this I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

The resolution (S. Res. 144) submitted by Mr. GALLINGER was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to communicate to the Senate at the earliest practicable day all information concerning the construction of a bridge across Rock Creek at Q Street NW., for which an appropriation was made in the act approved March 2, 1911, which appropriation proved to be inadequate under the plan that was submitted for bids, stating whether or not it is desirable to have a new plan made upon which fresh bids shall be invited, or whether it is feasible, without destroying the symmetry and beauty of the structure, to modify the existing plan so as to bring it within the appropriation.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina demands the regular order and it will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 29, line 1, strike out "25" and insert "35," and in line 2, strike out "3" and insert "6," so as to make the paragraph read:

101. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, lava, and all other stone suitable for use as monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn,

dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 35 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 6 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] gave notice that he would address the Senate this morning.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I desire to preface the remarks that I am now about to make on the tariff bill by the statement that the preparation of those remarks was, so far as my part of it was concerned, completed last Monday before the session of the Senate of that day. I make this statement because those who heard or may have read the address of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] on that Monday afternoon and who now hear or may hereafter read my own address may notice that there is a striking similarity of thought and expression in those two addresses on a certain question discussed by each of us.

I wish to preface my remarks by the further statement that I request my brother Senators that I be not interrupted during the presentation of my argument for any cause whatever, as I should like to have my address appear in connected form. In making this statement I am asking no more of others than I have always done for others, for during my term of service here I have only twice interrupted Senators in debate, and then each time because I knew they would like to be interrupted by me, and in each case they have afterwards thanked me for it. In my opinion the liberty of interruption in debate in this body is very greatly abused.

Mr. President, it is well known that I notified the Senate Democratic caucus that I could not vote for the Underwood tariff bill while it contained the free-sugar provision placed in it by the House and retained by the Senate Finance Committee and approved by the caucus and presented to the Senate as a Democratic Party measure.

It is also known to my brother Democrats that I expressly reserved in the caucus the right to offer amendments in the Senate, or vote for amendments offered there by others, having reference more particularly to agricultural products, while expressly stating at the same time that if such amendments were voted down I would subordinate my judgment in such matters to the party judgment, as nothing but the sugar provision of the bill would, in my opinion, justify me in refusing to vote for it as a whole, not only on account of party ties, but because I am in accord with by far the greater part of its provisions.

My reasons for refusing to vote for it without amendment of the sugar clause were given to my brother Democrats in the caucus and fully understood by them, but in justice to myself I wish these reasons to be known to the Senate as a body and to the country at large.

I hold, in the first place, that in my position as a Senator of the State of Louisiana my primary allegiance is due to that State and that I would not be justified in allowing my action to be controlled by the party caucus on any matter that concerned the vital interest of Louisiana when such acquiescence would have the effect of having me vote adversely to that vital interest.

These are the views I hold with reference to my duty to my State and to my party respectively, and by them I must abide as long as I have the honor of holding in this body the commission of the State of Louisiana.

I criticize no Senator for holding a different view as to his own duty, or even for thinking that I hold an erroneous view as to my own, but if any such there be, I ask them to remember that it is to my own State I am responsible and that I, not they, must bear the burden of that responsibility and the judgment that will be meted out to me by the people of Louisiana for my official actions here as their representative.

I hold, in the second place, that the promises I made to my people on any given question before they so highly honored me by selecting me for this position are binding on me in conscience and in honor when that question comes before me here for consideration.

I hold, in the third place, that when the people of my State have signified in an unmistakable manner their wishes on any public matter coming up for action before the body to which they have accredited me it is my bounden duty to carry out their wishes, so far as I can, and that irrespective of my own.

Having submitted these three propositions embodying my views as to the general principles which should govern my official action as a Senator of the State of Louisiana, I will now attempt to show their application to the special case under consideration.

It is hardly necessary to attempt to prove that, under my view of my duty to Louisiana, as defined by me under the first proposition, I am justified in opposing by all honorable means in my power the enactment of this bill, for I think there is no

contention against the conclusion that the sugar clause of it affects the vital interest of my State most unfavorably.

It has been admitted on the floor of the House of Representatives both by Mr. HARDWICK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Ways and Means that took the first testimony on the subject, and by Mr. UNDERWOOD, the chairman of the full committee that took the last, that free sugar would destroy the Louisiana sugar industry, though both feel justified in their course on sugar because they think the general welfare will be subserved by it.

It was in recognition of this fact that President Wilson requested and obtained the three years of grace that have been accorded us, in order that those in Louisiana who have been and are still dependent on the cultivation of cane as their means of livelihood might have this time in which to try to make arrangements for their livelihood in other ways.

I appreciate this consideration on the part of the President and thank him for it in the name of the people of Louisiana principally interested, even while deeply regretting that he considered it his duty to insist on ultimate free sugar, that being legislation which in their opinion, and in my own, is neither sanctioned by the principles of necessity nor the general welfare nor justice.

On the second proposition, the proper regard for pledges made to my constituents, I wish to say that just previous to my election by the General Assembly of Louisiana in the beginning of December, 1910, that body passed a resolution inviting all candidates for the Senatorship to appear before it and give an expression of their views on national questions, with special reference to the tariff question, and the four candidates for the office appeared before the legislature and gave an expression of their views, and I now make the following quotation from my address, which was published in the Louisiana papers immediately afterwards:

The statement published in a New Orleans paper that on last Thursday night, at a conference of my friends, I had recanted my statement of Wednesday and said I would yield in my tariff views on sugar, rice, and lumber, if necessary, to be in line with the action of a Democratic caucus, is false. Those gentlemen from every part of the State who attended that large conference know how false is the statement that I had recanted. They know that my answer to the question as to whether I was a Democrat and would abide by the action of a Democratic caucus on these matters was, that while I was a Democrat, I would never abide by the action of any caucus that might force me to strike a blow at any of the great industries of my State. This has been my unwavering position from the beginning.

I do not feel that this is or ought to be made a test of fealty to the National Democratic Party. I hope and I believe that I will never be placed in the position where my duty to my national party will come in conflict with my duty to my people. But, if ever the time does come, those who have placed their faith in my plighted word will find that their faith was not misplaced.

If my mother is to be stabbed, some other hand than mine must be found to wield the knife.

I will now quote an extract from my speech of acceptance after my election, which was also at once published in the Louisiana papers:

But tariff duties must be levied. Agriculture is the great basic foundation of the prosperity of Louisiana, and it will continue to be so. Because the agriculturists of the United States generally raise more than our own people consume we are exporters of such products, and thus they do not receive the benefit of a protective tariff, while bearing so many of its unjust burdens. So, if a tariff can be levied that will help, or protect, if you please, those who follow agriculture as a livelihood, I think it should be done. In Louisiana at least two of our great soil productions can be helped or protected by a tariff duty; those two are sugar and rice.

And so I can certainly justify myself in doing what I can in the Congress of the United States to help these great agricultural products of Louisiana. This accords with my sense of right to those producers, with my sense of duty to my State, and with my individual sentiments as well, for I am descended from a long line of agriculturists, am a son of the soil, and racy of it.

I do not see why party fealty should prevent me from standing by these great industries of Louisiana, but, as I have said, if it does, national fealty must yield to State fealty, as it did in the time of the Civil War.

These were some of the words spoken by me to the members of the General Assembly of Louisiana, including three who honored me by their votes then who have since been themselves honored by being elected to the Congress of the United States, and who further honored me by coming from their Chamber to-day to listen to these remarks.

It will be noted that in my pre-election address I unequivocally declared that I would not only stand for a duty on sugar, but would not abide by the action of any Democratic caucus that sought to restrain me on this question.

It will be further noted that in my postelection address I reiterated this statement, thus doubly binding myself.

It seems to me that every member of this body should readily recognize the fact that under these circumstances I can not vote for the passage of the present bill while it carries the free-sugar provision without personal dishonor and the attendant

loss of my own self-respect, as well as the respect of the people of my State and of my brother Senators, all of whom now understand my situation.

On the third proposition, the voice of the people of Louisiana expressing their views on the subject, I will say that in the first days of June, 1912, a convention of the Democratic Party of the State of Louisiana, composed of delegates from every part of the State, met in its capital city of Baton Rouge to select delegates to the approaching National Democratic convention at Baltimore and to adopt a platform setting forth the principles of the State Democracy of Louisiana.

That convention overwhelmingly refused to adopt a minority report of the committee on resolutions, signed by one member thereof, declaring for a "tariff for revenue only" and overwhelmingly adopted the following resolution:

We are in favor of a revision of the tariff which will meet the revenue requirements of the National Treasury and will abate the protective system with the least possible abatement of our business fabric.

We hold that the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer, but in reducing it to a purely revenue basis we would not sanction the injustice of crudely remodeling the tariff schedules in such a way as to force any one industry, previously dependent on the tariff, to sell in a free-trade market and buy in a protected one; nor would we contemplate the turning of the American market over to manipulation of foreign tariffs and export bounties, where the results would be the wiping out of an American industry by a temporary lowering of prices and a subsequent raising of prices under foreign control for foreign enrichment.

We espouse these principles not solely because they would forbid the heavy and cruel blow proposed against Louisiana, but because they are applicable to any industry in any State and because they are the necessary guides to all just men striving for a tariff reform which will destroy evils for the consumer without creating them for the producer.

It is evident that this platform resolution of the Democratic Party of Louisiana is an unmistakable expression of hostility to the free-sugar provision of the present tariff bill, the resolution specially referring to the free-sugar bill that had passed the House and was then pending in the Senate.

And so I feel that under each and all of the three propositions laid down by me in the beginning as a guide for my action in this matter, I am forbidden to vote for this tariff measure unless amended by striking out the provision removing all duties from sugar at the end of three years.

Aside from these special reasons which would prevent me as a representative of the State of Louisiana from favoring this new-fangled Democratic doctrine of free sugar, I can say with perfect sincerity that I would feel most hostile to the abolition of the sugar duty, not only because of my well-known and often-expressed views in favor of legislation that would advance the agricultural interests of any part of my country, but because of the tariff policy of the Democratic Party, with which I have been identified since I was old enough to cast my first vote.

To me it seems almost incredible that the great political party which has always stood so steadfastly for the doctrine of a revenue tariff should now appear willing to abandon its settled and unassailable doctrine on the question of a duty on sugar.

The saying that sugar is an ideal article for a revenue tax is trite and has never been disputed, and no Democrat, not even a free-sugar Democrat, can be found hardy enough to deny it, even at this time.

This is due to the admitted facts of the case, viz, the universal consumption of the article, the consequent fairness of the distribution of the tax among all classes of the people, the ease and certainty of its collection by the Government, and the fact that three-fourths of the duty goes into the Government Treasury for the benefit of all the people, while only one-fourth inures to the protection of the sugar producer.

For these reasons sugar has always been held in the past by the Democratic Party to be a subject most eminently fitted for the imposition of a revenue tax, and it is just as much fitted for it in the present and for the future as it has been in the past.

I have briefly condensed above the reasons why the Democratic Party has in the past so steadfastly upheld the justice of a tax on sugar, but they are given far better in the language of the minority members of the Finance Committee in their report submitted to the Senate on July 27, 1912, on the Underwood free-sugar bill, which had passed the House, the said minority report advocating a reduction of 33½ per cent from the existing rate in the Payne-Aldrich bill and abolishing the refiners' differential and Dutch standard, while the Republican majority report advocated the retention of the present duty, and also abolished the refiners' differential and Dutch standard, which operates solely in the interest of the cane-sugar refiners, giving neither protection to the producers nor revenue to the Government.

I quote herewith such part of the minority report as is applicable to the point:

The tariff on sugar is peculiarly a revenue tariff. Very much the major part of the tax levied upon the consumer of sugars and sweets goes actually into the United States Treasury for the use and behoof and benefit of the American people. A minor part of the tax goes into

the pockets of the producers. Upon numberless articles in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill the duties are either prohibitive or very nearly prohibitive, or highly exploitive, and in all these cases very much the major part of the tax levied upon the consumer goes into the pockets of the American producers, a special and favored class, and very scantily and sometimes not at all reaches the Treasury. In the next place, the majority of the tariff schedules which have been adopted by the House and sent over to the Senate during this Congress make a reduction of about one-third. In the face of its record in connection with other bills, the House reduced the duties upon sugars and the products of cane and sugar beets 100 per cent; in other words, entirely canceled the existing duties. It seemed to us that this was not in keeping with the promises of Democratic platforms to reduce present protective duties "gradually" toward and finally to a revenue basis. We have seen no reason why sugar should have been excepted from the general policy advocated by the Democratic Party and believed by us to be right.

Again, in levying an import duty upon sugar for revenue purposes, we are imitating the time-honored and time-justified precedents.

This report was signed by such stalwart tariff-for-revenue Democrats as Joseph W. Bailey, F. M. SIMMONS, W. J. STONE, JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, JOHN W. KERN, and CHARLES F. JOHNSON, all of whom, with the exception of the first named, are still members of the Senate.

In this report they enunciated the soundest Democratic doctrine and imitated, as they correctly said, "the time-honored and time-justified precedents" of the Democratic Party.

No Democrat in this body dreamed of denying the absolute correctness of this statement considered as an exposition of Democratic doctrine.

It was true then, and it is as true now as it was then.

If it is not correct Democratic doctrine, I wish some Democratic Senator to rise in his seat after I have concluded, or as later thereafter as he sees fit, and show wherein it is incorrect.

These words were quoted by my colleague from Louisiana in his great and unanswerable argument on this question addressed to the Senate on June 2 last, but I choose to repeat them in this address, for they can not be repeated too often in these times of dangerous Democratic departure from Democratic doctrine, and they should be burned into the brains and hearts and consciences of Democratic Senators.

Small wonder is it that in the debate on the sugar bill on that same 27th of July, 1912, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], than whom no member of this body is better posted on the history of the Democratic Party, including necessarily its tariff policy, should have said:

There is not the slightest anticipation in the mind of any intelligent man that it will be placed on the free list, not even if a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House and a Democratic President come into power.

His thorough knowledge of Democratic principles in regard to the tariff fully justified the Senator from Mississippi in making this statement, but we now see verified the truth of the saying: "It is the unexpected that happens."

I am not false to the principles of the Democratic Party in refusing to follow it along the strange and devious pathway it is now pursuing with regard to the tariff on sugar.

I am true to those principles, and it is the Democratic Party itself that is seeking to depart from them.

I am no traitor to the Democratic Party because loyalty to my State forbids me to vote for this bill in its present form.

Not since the time I cast my first vote in 1868 for the National Democratic Party have I ever faltered in my allegiance to its nominees.

More than once in the dark days of Louisiana politics, days that have happily passed forever, I have taken my life in my hands at the polls in the effort to aid their election, and twice during that stormy time I was arrested by United States marshals and carried to the city of New Orleans, 250 miles from my home, charged with alleged violations of the Civil Rights Bill, though my experience in these matters was the experience of hundreds of other Democrats in my State and probably in her sister Southern States.

Not in all that time have I failed to vote in any election, and never have I scratched a Democratic ticket—national, congressional, State, district, parochial, or municipal.

There have been times when my judgment was strongly opposed to certain policies of the National Democratic Party, notably in 1896 on the free-silver question.

But while to the knowledge of all in my community I was a Gold Democrat, it never entered into my mind to think of leaving the regular Democratic Party to train with those Democrats who followed another standard, although its followers embraced many of the ablest and best men of my State.

On the contrary, I presided over the parish ratification meeting held in my city and told them there was only one National Democratic Party in the country and its nominees were Bryan and Sewall and not Palmer and Buckner.

And I did my best to steady my people against the tide of opposition that was running high among the business interests of my State, and when the election came, against the remon-

strance of my family and friends, I rose from a bed of severe illness of many days' duration and was driven to the polls in order to deposit my ballot, accompanied by my family physician, with his hand on my pulse and assisting my tottering steps, in the discharge of what I considered a political duty, and hoping to set a good example to others.

And since I have been a Member of this body I have attended every Democratic caucus held and have never failed to vote in every respect in accordance with the expressed wish of those caucuses, except in the solitary instance of the sugar tariff bill of last year, when I refused to vote for a reduction of 33½ per cent, under which the sugar industry of my State could not survive.

I have the right to say that in so far as concerns the performance of duty to my party at all times in the past my conscience is void of offense.

And the people of Louisiana have at all times retained their allegiance to the National Democratic Party in spite of the fact that the economic policies of that party were not as favorable to the development of their great material resources and industries as were the economic policies of the Republican Party.

Yet I have no hesitation in saying that the National Democratic Party owes more to the State of Louisiana than the State of Louisiana owes to the National Democratic Party.

Louisiana received no aid from the National Democratic Party when she overthrew carpetbag and negro rule and established the right of the intelligence and virtue of the State to control it instead of its ignorance and corruption.

Through the courage and determination of her white people she established white supremacy in the face of national Republican domination and with Federal bayonets at the polls, stationed there in the attempt to coerce her people, and she maintained it under successive national Republican administrations, and she will maintain it forever, no matter what party may be in power at Washington.

Happily for Louisiana and for the country at large, the time has long passed when the Republican Party had either the ability or the inclination to coerce the States of the South, and the time will never come again in the history of this country.

The great majority of the present generation in Louisiana have grown up since the dark days of reconstruction and know nothing of it save by tradition.

And the only difference they have seen in the State, arising from changes of national administrations, is the difference of a few Federal officeholders.

They have seen the hand of the General Government under Republican administrations always stretched out to afford them relief in their times of distress due to pestilence and floods, and they know that the National Democratic Party, if it had been in power, could have done no more for them in this regard.

They know nothing of what their fathers endured in the 10 years that followed the Civil War, and their thoughts are of the present material conditions of their State and not of the animosities of the past.

But we, the fathers, remember, and we have constantly striven to steady the impulses of the sons in favor of the National Democratic Party and keep them true to the faith.

And now they are to be slain by the party in which they have placed their trust and for which the people of Louisiana have given of their time, labor, money, and even their blood in the earlier days, and of their time, labor, and money in the later days to establish in power; and when the fair form of Louisiana has been pierced by this poisoned shaft, like the stricken eagle of which the poet tells, she can view in her body, while writhing in agony, the fatal arrow tipped with a feather from her own wing.

It is hard; very, very hard.

But the Democratic House has decreed free sugar and the Democratic Finance Committee and Democratic Senate caucus have ratified the action of the House, and the blow will probably fall on Louisiana, unless the consciences of some Senators are quickened sufficiently to make them stay their hand before the final act of the tragedy is concluded.

Some alleviation of the blow is given in consequence of the three years of grace granted at the instance of President Wilson, and in allowing the present duty to remain until March, 1914, a concession urgently requested by both the eastern cane-sugar refiners and the Louisiana cane-sugar and western beet-sugar producers; and for this much we are thankful.

In this connection I wish in behalf of the people of Louisiana to thank the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for having vainly tried in both the majority subcommittee and full committee to keep a duty on sugar, and while we regret that he would not vote for the retention of the duty in the Demo-

cratic Senate caucus, we appreciate his having done as much for us as he did, he being the only Senator, so far as I am advised, who so voted in either the sub or full committee.

And I wish to give in the name of the State of Louisiana special thanks to my honored and respected friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who was the only southern Senator, and, indeed, the only Senator from any State not interested in the sugar industry, who voted to the last in the caucus against free sugar and only yielded to its dictate when further resistance to its evident will was unavailing, he being moved in his action not only by sympathy for his fellow Democrats of Louisiana, but by his knowledge that this step was not only a departure from the true principles of the Democratic Party but was in his judgment a grave economic error as well.

I wish to assure him now that while he has long commanded in the past the respect of my people on account of the great force as well as the sterling integrity of his character, in the future that respect will be combined with gratitude and affection.

No attempt has been made and none probably will be made on this floor to show that this act of the Democratic Party is not a most radical departure from its "time-honored and time-justified precedents."

The reports of both the House and Senate majority committees on the reasons for this change are singularly meager, the first body contenting itself with saying:

"The action of the committee with regard to sugar shows an appreciation of the commercial conditions involved and the committee's desire to respond to the public demands for free sugar,

while the latter gave no reasons at all.

Considering that they were all Democrats it is not surprising that they preferred to give as little discussion as possible to the subject.

An effort has been made, however, on this floor, to prove that the Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party calls for free sugar, and to justify this legislation on that ground. This is a very far-fetched conclusion, but some justification must be sought for this sudden departure from "the time-honored and time-justified precedents" of the Democratic Party, and this is a case of "any port in a storm."

I not only deny that the Democratic platform calls, even by inference, for free sugar, but claim that, on the contrary, its spirit, if not its letter, clearly forbids such legislation, though I admit that under its letter, though not its spirit, a material reduction of the duty on sugar is justifiable.

The statement therein that "material reductions be speedily made upon the necessities of life" would in its letter apply to the duty on sugar, assuming it to be a necessary of life and admitting it to be such for the purpose of argument; but we must consider that the spirit of these words was intended to apply to such necessities of life as have greatly advanced in price during the last 10 years, and therefore are conducive to the present high cost of living; but this can not apply to sugar, because it is the one necessary of life that has steadily lowered in price during that time while all others have increased.

But at the utmost it could not be claimed that this clause provided for more than a material reduction in the duty on sugar.

The positive inhibition against free sugar is found in the clause:

"We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry."

If the Louisiana cane and Western beet-sugar industry of this country that has been built up under "our system of tariff taxation," and which represents over \$100,000,000 of capital invested in factories alone, to say nothing of land, teams, and implements, and which in cultivation and harvesting alone gives employment to more than 200,000 laborers, and directly or indirectly contributes to the support of 2,000,000 people of the United States, is not a legitimate industry, I should like to know what is.

My colleague, in his address already referred to, has pointed out the immense importance of the industry in those dependencies of the United States—Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, the representatives of the first two named insisting that their prosperity is entirely dependent on the production of sugar and that the abolition of the duty thereon would bankrupt them through the consequent destruction of the industry, while the representatives of the last named insist that they can not continue the industry, which is a large and growing one with them, without the aid of a duty; and I shall not dwell further on that phase of the question.

I repeat that the Democratic platform never demanded expressly or inferentially the total abolition of the duty on sugar.

The platform committee of the Baltimore convention was composed of a representative from each State, and that committee appointed from its ranks a subcommittee of 11 to draft the platform for submission to the full committee, which in turn submitted it to the convention for ratification.

That subcommittee consisted, among others, of Senators KERN, O'GORMAN, WALSH, MARTIN of Virginia, POMERENE, and CLARKE of Arkansas, all of whom are still Members of this body.

It is fairly safe to assume that these gentlemen knew what they meant by the language they used and *certainly* safe to assume that they understood what they meant better than do those who were not members of the committee and had nothing to do with framing the resolutions.

If any of these Senators considered at the time they framed this platform that it demanded the total abolition of the duty on sugar, I would like to have them say so at the conclusion of my remarks or at any time thereafter that may suit their convenience.

I apprehend that none of them will so state, believing that the most liberal construction of the language by any of them would be that it left the matter open for the future consideration of the Democratic Party.

We know from what has previously been said on this floor that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who acted as a member of the full committee, considered that the language committed the party against free sugar, and he preached that interpretation of it throughout the campaign.

We know that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who was a member of the subcommittee, held and proclaimed the same view in his campaign, and, as was very properly stated on this floor by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the 15th of May last: "There sits before me the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who made several campaigns in the West in the bravest possible manner for the Democratic Party, and he was faced by his opponent in one of those campaigns, who said: 'If the Democrats came into power they would put sugar upon the free list.' The Senator denied it, and he had every right to deny it."

Through the address of my colleague on May 15 last, previously referred to, we have the statement of Congressman BROUSSARD of Louisiana, who will succeed me in this body in 1915, and who was himself a member of that subcommittee of 11 selected to draft the platform.

Mr. BROUSSARD, who was particularly interested in the formation of a platform that would not indicate a spirit of hostility to the great sugar industry of his State, and who I feel morally sure was placed on that subcommittee because of the fact that he represented the greatest sugar-producing district of Louisiana (though I have no warrant from him to make this statement), and who had exceptional opportunities for knowing the mind of the committee on that question, not only most emphatically denied in that statement that the language of the platform was intended to convey the idea that the Democratic Party advocated free sugar, but asserts positively that, on the contrary, the committee refused to consider the telegrams with which it was being bombarded at the time by Frank C. Lowry, agent and representative of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., asking the committee to include in the platform a plank for free sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD says further that the ardent plea of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] for free sugar made before the drafting of the platform met with no response from either the subcommittee that drafted the platform or from the full committee.

It is absolutely certain that Mr. BROUSSARD was convinced of the truth of this statement.

He was a Wilson delegate at the Baltimore convention, and was very largely instrumental in influencing the Democratic Party of Louisiana to select a number of Wilson delegates.

He returned to Louisiana and assured the people of that State that in the event of the election of Gov. Wilson through the success of the Democratic Party the great sugar industry of Louisiana would neither be destroyed nor materially injured, and dwelt on the platform declaration of the Baltimore convention as an evidence of the correctness of his statement.

Col. Robert Ewing, national committeeman from Louisiana, like Mr. BROUSSARD, a strong Wilson man, and, like him, powerfully instrumental in securing the selection of Wilson delegates and who went to the convention as a Wilson delegate himself, and who had great opportunities of knowing what might be called "the secret history" of the Baltimore convention, was also fully satisfied that under the platform of the party the sugar industry of his State would be safe and he, too, preached that doctrine to her people, never believing that

anything more than a reduction of the present duty would be possible under a Democratic administration.

Some of the largest sugar planters of Louisiana went to the Baltimore convention as Wilson delegates and they returned home entirely satisfied that their industry was safe.

The press of Louisiana, that discussed the situation, fully agreed with this view and throughout the length and breadth of the State not a single newspaper expressed a contrary view.

The people of Louisiana relied on the representations of their delegates to the Baltimore convention and on the statements of the press and on the assurance given them by the language of the platform.

The speech of acceptance of the Democratic nominee further fortified their minds on this question and no public word that fell from his lips during the campaign was calculated to remove the impression they had received.

In this connection I wish to say that I feel morally sure the presidential nominee of the Democratic Party did not expect at the time of his nomination or during his campaign to become an advocate of free sugar. I feel morally sure that his determination on this point was reached at some period after his election.

I have no warrant from him or anyone speaking for him for this conclusion of mine, but I must believe it to be a correct conclusion unless he states it is an erroneous one.

I know of no clearer exposition of this question, considered with reference to the meaning of the Democratic platform in relation to sugar and the position of the people of Louisiana on the sugar question than that given by Col. Robert Ewing, national committeeman from Louisiana, heretofore alluded to, in an editorial written by him in one of his newspapers, the New Orleans Daily States, on 24th March last and which is reproduced in its entirety below:

SUGAR AND THE PARTY PLATFORM.

Our excellent contemporary, the Mobile Register, ridicules the Picaune's suggestion that a "free-sugar" bill in the House involves any conspiracy against the sugar industry.

It is well to remember," says the Register, "that the party platform was written plainly and put before the people, and the people knew what they were doing when they elected the party to full control of the Government."

That is quite true, but our Mobile contemporary will find nothing in the platform or the speeches of the Democratic nominee that either imposes on the party an obligation to put sugar on the free list or would justify it in action certain to be destructive to the industry.

The inner history of the Baltimore convention has never been written; but the official records show that, although Senator JAMES, the permanent chairman, declared for free sugar, the convention in its platform eliminated sugar by name and put therein no language which even by implication could be construed into a pledge or promise to strike it from the dutiable list.

What the convention said in substance at Denver was that all industries should stand on the same relative level and that no reduction should be made that would paralyze or destroy any industry. At Baltimore it reaffirmed that doctrine.

President Wilson in his speeches followed literally the language and the spirit of the platform. He declared unequivocally for a revision downward of the tariff duties. But nowhere did he assert a duty ought to be removed or so radically cut as to carry with it extinction of any industry.

Louisiana is making no demand for a violation of the party pledges. It is not seeking to stand in the way of a vindication of party pledges. It could not afford to do so without inviting inevitable disaster. It is only asking that its industry shall not be singled out, discriminated against and destroyed, when that industry produces an article which the Democratic Party from its birth has considered an ideal article on which to levy tribute to meet the expenses of the Government, and when in the latest expression of the party and its candidate we find the solemn pledge that revision shall be gradual and fair, so as not to bring about commercial, industrial, or financial cataclysms.

Louisiana opposition to free sugar involves no sacrifice or surrender of Democratic principle. It is in perfect harmony with party tradition and contemporaneous party expression.

Louisiana does not expect to see sugar picked out for special favor by the retention of the duty now imposed on the foreign product. It expects to see sugar cut. But it is appealing for fair play, for equal treatment with the industries of other States, for a lowering of the rate that will still leave the planter a margin of profit, at least until there is opportunity for a readjustment of agricultural conditions.

Our Mobile contemporary is not within the record when it suggests, inferentially, that free sugar is a party pledge. The "party platform" was written plainly. Louisiana is perfectly willing to abide the result if the platform is carried out in its letter and spirit.

I quote an extract from another editorial in the same paper headed "Louisiana and the Tariff" appearing in its issue of June 2, 1913:

LOUISIANA AND THE TARIFF.

What Louisiana Democrats ask, therefore, is not a concession of protection for the sugar industry, but a mere abiding by the pledges of the party in the last campaign and the carrying out of a time-honored Democratic policy of preserving sugar as a revenue producer.

The language of National Committeeman Robert Ewing correctly represents the attitude of the people of Louisiana on the question of a tariff on sugar.

They understood the possibility or even probability of a reduction of the duty and they were prepared to accept it, assuming it to be a reasonable reduction that would permit the industry to survive.

They did not expect it to be specially favored over other industries, but they certainly did not expect it to be specially singled out for destruction by the Democratic Party as is now sought to be done.

They would submit to the present reduction, and strive bravely and intelligently to make a living under it, if only the duty would be permitted to continue.

And the deductions and conclusions of Col. Ewing as to the meaning of the tariff plank of the Democratic platform are such as would be most naturally drawn by any unbiased person of ordinary intelligence who had no personal or political interest in seeking to twist the meaning to coincide with his own wishes.

My people hold, and their Senators hold with them, that the destruction of their industry through a removal of the duty is not only a cruel injustice to them but a violation both of the party platform and of the settled tariff policy of the party, and many thousands of voters in the country will claim and believe that their votes for the Democratic Party were obtained under false pretenses.

The circumstances attending this complete reversal of the policy of the Democratic Party on the question of a tariff on sugar make it all the harder for those who must suffer on account of that reversal, for it is well known to all who have posted themselves on the subject, though all of them may not be willing to admit it, that the agitation for free sugar which has culminated in the present action of the Democratic Party was begun and carried forward to successful completion by the group of eastern cane-sugar refiners that I call the American Sugar Trust, composed of the American Sugar Refining Co., the Federal Sugar Refining Co., the Arbuckle people, and two or three other corporations, none of whom cultivate either sugar cane or sugar beets in this country.

I know that the name of "Sugar Trust" was applied originally to the American Sugar Refining Co., the most powerful of these concerns, and that some of the others, and also some Democrats, would be unwilling to admit that the others are a part of the "trust," but I claim that for all practical purposes they have been in a combination for years.

It is also well known to all who have read the testimony before the various committees, though all of them may not be willing to admit it, that these cane-sugar refiners are united in their demand for either free sugar or a large reduction in the present duty. The American Sugar Refining Co., on account of its large sugar holdings in Cuba, does not wish perhaps for absolute free sugar because it would then cease to receive the benefit of the 20 per cent Cuban preferential it now enjoys, and would be content with a heavy cut, but even that company would prefer free sugar to a retention of the present rate.

It is also well known to all who have read the testimony, though all of them may not be willing to admit it, that the reason why this group of refiners desires either free sugar or a great reduction in the rate of duty is because of the tremendous and ever-increasing development of the beet-sugar industry of the Western States, that has been competing with them in the sale of sugar and forced their prices down.

They were forced to admit this on the witness stand, and yet some Democrats seem willing to believe that these people were actuated by the desire to reduce the price of sugar to the consuming public.

Four years ago, when this agitation for free sugar was begun by these refiners, there was no complaint by the American consumers on account of the price of sugar. They knew the price was low, knew that the price had fallen while the price of other necessities of life had steadily risen, and they were not complaining at paying 5 cents per pound for the finest white refined sugar.

The refiners did not care about the Louisiana product, for they used that themselves, it being principally what is technically called "raw sugar."

But the beet-sugar industry of the West turned out ready for consumption the same grade of refined sugar as they did, and was constantly increasing its output until it was encroaching on what these eastern refiners were pleased to designate in their testimony as "our territory," meaning the territory east of the Mississippi River.

It became necessary to check this strong competition, which, as they admit, was reducing their profits too greatly.

And so this agitation was started, being conducted by the Federal Sugar Refining Co., of which Mr. C. A. Spreckels was the head, under the supervision of its sales agent, Mr. Lowry, fraudulently pretending to be the "Committee of Wholesale Grocers" of the United States, which fraud was finally exposed through the testimony given before the Hardwick committee.

And by representations to the people that they would get sugar from 1½ to 2 cents per pound cheaper under free sugar

they succeeded in working up the sentiment in its favor that the Democratic Party thinks it would be good political policy at the present time to defer to, even at the cost of the subversion of party principle.

The testimony on these points has been detailed by my colleague and by other Senators who have preceded me in debate, and I will not repeat it here.

And what will be the result of this action of the Democratic Party, so ardently desired by this Cane Sugar Trust? Certainly the admitted destruction of the Louisiana industry and also of the western industry if its representatives are to be believed; but if not entirely destroyed, at least partially so, and its further development permanently checked, so that it will no longer be a successful competitor of this Eastern Cane Sugar Trust that I have alluded to, forcing it to lower its prices to the American consumers.

And then what will result? By every law of business that governs in such cases and by the experience of the past this Cane Sugar Trust will raise its prices when the competition against it is removed.

It will no longer fear that the advent of the beet-sugar crop on the scene of action in a time of scarcity will cause it to lower its prices from 1½ to 2 cents per pound, as it did in 1911. It will be in supreme control of the market, its only competitor having been killed by the action of the Democratic Party, and the consuming public will be at its mercy.

But it seems to be the policy of the Democratic Party at this time to pay far more regard to the interests of the eastern cane-sugar refiners than to the interests of the American cane and beet sugar producers, and to defer entirely to the opinion of the refiners as to the effect of free sugar that they were demanding, ignoring entirely the opinion of the producers.

Thus in the report of the majority on the House free-sugar bill of last year the opinion of Mr. Claus Spreckels alone as to the desirability of free sugar is quoted, he arguing for it, of course.

Likewise, in the same report he is quoted to prove that the price to the American consumer would be reduced by the full amount of the duty.

The report is very unfair in attempting to prove the same thing by Mr. Willett, the sugar expert, by quoting a fragmentary statement of his testimony.

Mr. Willett can only be fairly judged by his last expression on the subject, which was that the abolition of the duty might reduce the price here at times, and at other times it would not, but that if the domestic production was destroyed the American price would necessarily be set by the world price, which was often higher than here; and that the only certain way to make a permanent reduction of price here was to increase the domestic production, the increase of the domestic production being more to the interest of the American consumer than the abolition of the duty.

This statement was fully set forth by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] in his recent address to the Senate, and I will not quote it here.

The report says "the industrial position of refining requires primary consideration."

Certainly, in so far as the position of the eastern cane-sugar refiners is concerned, they received "primary consideration" in the last sugar-tariff bill and in the present one. They have been given all they asked, and they could not well expect more.

This is the same Mr. Claus Spreckels who contributed \$5,000 to the Democratic campaign fund last year, just 50 times what I felt able to contribute, and then compelled to give it in two monthly installments; but he had a great special interest to be subserved by the success of the Democratic Party, while I had only the general interest of a citizen.

Moreover, he naturally felt sore against the Republican Party, it being through that party he had been sued to return to the Government \$119,000 of the sum it claimed his company had defrauded it out of through false sugar weights, as has been shown by my colleague, and besides he knew he could not expect free sugar from the Republican Party. How much more was subscribed by the Sugar Trust under various names I do not know.

It can safely be assumed that these eastern refiners will contribute heavily to the next national Democratic campaign fund, for if gratitude does not compel them to do so, self-interest certainly will.

The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee very plainly showed that his sympathies were with the eastern refiners and against the great and growing beet-sugar interests of this country by his remarks in the House last May when he said the beet-sugar people were after taxing the American people in order to finally bring their sugar to the Atlantic seaboard and drive out all competition.

But suppose they did drive the eastern sugar trust out of business, which is the very danger the refiners fear from the expanding beet-sugar industry?

They can only do it by underselling them; that is, by giving the consumers cheaper sugar than the trust could give them, and I thought cheaper sugar was the party slogan.

The sugar-beet people, operating 500 or 1,000 factories by that time in at least 20 States, could not form a trust as these half dozen cane-sugar refiners have done and can always do.

But if it was possible for the beet-sugar people operating over so great an area to form a trust and put up the price of sugar they could at any time be curbed by abolishing the duty; but if the domestic industry is destroyed it can not be renewed readily and the eastern refiners could not be restrained in their extortion because sugar would be free already.

And if any interest is to be destroyed, which is best to destroy—the business of the eastern refiners, who, as my colleague told you, produce nothing and employ only 10,000 men, or the great sugar-beet industry, producing all its product in field and factory and giving employment to hundreds of thousands of people in farm and factory work?

Think of the possible result to this country if this great necessary of life, the production of which all other countries so sedulously foster, should be no longer produced here and we should have a war with a strong foreign power! All our sugar would have to be brought from over seas and a stronger naval power than ourselves could prevent its transportation. Owing, I am very sorry to say, to the action of the Democratic Party during the last two years, we are falling so far behind in naval preparation that at the present rate we will become a fifth-rate power in four years, inferior even to Japan. Is not this food for thought?

Mr. Willett is undoubtedly right in claiming that the increase of production will bring about the decrease of price to the American consumer; and I deny the assertion that the people of Louisiana are enriching themselves at the expense of the remainder of the people.

I claim that on the contrary they are assisting in keeping down the price of sugar in this country through their production of it, a production which would greatly expand in Louisiana if there was some stability in the sugar-tariff question.

Can it be supposed that the price of an article in a country will decrease on account of the decrease of its production in that country?

Yet that is the theory on which the free-sugar advocates in the Democratic Party seem to be working.

I am not fighting free sugar solely because it is a Louisiana product and because the destruction of the industry there will inflict incalculable damage on my State—damage from which it will take her long years to recover and from which she will not recover in my lifetime.

I am not a sectionalist. I wish for the prosperity of all parts of my country, and I am unwilling to see any part of it suffer.

I stood on this floor in 1911 fighting against the Canadian reciprocity treaty because it was unjust to the farming interests of some parts of the country, though not injuring any agricultural product of Louisiana, and said that I stood for the agricultural interests of every section of this country—North, South, East, and West—and that the interests of the wheat and oat and barley growers of the Northwestern border States and of the Middle West, and of the dairy producers of New York and Vermont would receive from me the same consideration that I would extend to the agricultural interests of Louisiana or any Southern State.

And even if Louisiana should be injured, I would wish other States to be uninjured.

After seeking unavailingly in the Senate Democratic caucus to have the free-sugar provision of the bill stricken out, so that the duty could permanently remain at 1 cent per pound, I voted for the resolution of another Senator fixing the permanent duty at one-half cent per pound after May, 1916, saying to the caucus that I knew the Louisiana industry could not live under that rate of duty, but even if the cane-sugar industry had to die I wished the beet-sugar industry to live if possible, not only because it was a great agricultural interest of the West, but because in its survival lay the only hope of salvation of the American public from the domination of the American Sugar Trust, composed of the group of eastern cane-sugar refiners.

No; I wish to contribute as well as I can to the prosperity of the agricultural interests of every part of my country as well as that of my own State, and where they can be helped by the imposition of a duty on foreign products that compete with their own I am always ready to give it to them.

And therefore I am glad that the citrus-fruit growers of Florida have been given protection by this bill, even though the

Senators from that State are willing to see the Louisiana sugar industry destroyed.

And I do not stop at agricultural interests, although they appeal to me more closely than do manufacturing interests, for, as I said in that same Canadian reciprocity speech that I have previously alluded to, I did not wish to see destroyed a single industry of my country that was assisting in her development and giving employment to her citizens, and therefore I am glad that the cotton manufacturers of Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia also have been given protection by this bill, even though the Senators from those States are willing to see the Louisiana sugar industry destroyed.

And as no warrant has been given by the platform of the Democratic Party to pass a free-sugar bill, so has no warrant been given it to do so by the vote of the American people at the last national election, nor for that matter was any indorsement given by that vote to the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue only.

The Democrats did not win on the tariff issue, though in certain localities that issue contributed to their success.

I hear Senators occasionally say on this floor that the verdict of the people last year was against protection and the doctrine has been repudiated by the country. In the face of the vote I marvel how such statements can be made.

The returns show that the combined Republican and Progressive vote outnumbered the Democratic vote by more than 1,250,000, and we know that not less than three-quarters of a million regular Republicans voted the Democratic ticket just in order to defeat Col. Roosevelt in States where it was not possible for the Republicans to win, and the Democratic presidential ticket received a majority vote over all other candidates in only 11 out of the 48 States of the Union, all of them being Southern States.

President Wilson could most correctly say at Newark, N. J., on May 1:

I want everybody to realize that I have not been taken in by the results of the last national election. The country did not go Democratic in November. It was impossible for it to go Republican, because it could not tell what kind of Republican to go.

And likewise Speaker CHAMP CLARK spoke correctly when, in a speech delivered in Washington on June 2, he said, speaking of the Democratic Party:

We are in power by a 2,000,000 minority.

I have heard remarks on this floor to the effect that the Democrats in their tariff policy are embodying the views of the Progressive Party also, and quoting its platform declaration of condemnation of the Payne-Aldrich bill; but they seem not to be familiar with or ignore that part of the Progressive platform which unequivocally indorses the principle of a tariff for protection in these words:

We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries both for the farmer and the manufacturer and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living,

and also unequivocally denounced the tariff policy of the Democratic Party in these words:

The Democratic Party is committed to the destruction of the protective system through a tariff for revenue only, a policy which would inevitably produce widespread industrial and commercial disaster.

It was not the belief of the American people in the tariff policy of the Democratic Party that elected its candidate, but the split in the Republican Party that gave him a plurality election.

Whether the Democratic Party will succeed next time depends on two facts—the practical working of the new tariff law and the ability of the Republicans to get together again.

If the new law works well, the Democrats may succeed even if the Republican breach is healed. If it is not healed, the Democrats will certainly win; but if it is healed and the law works injuriously to the interests of the country, then the Democrats will surely lose.

I, however, now venture the prediction that in the event of Democratic defeat in the next national election that party will never again declare for a tariff for revenue only, but will sacrifice its tariff policy on that subject then just as it is sacrificing it now on sugar, and for the same reason, the hope of profiting politically thereby.

There are many shades of belief in this country on the question of the tariff, ranging from high tariff to free trade, though the latter is not practicable now; but certainly those who believe in a tariff for revenue only are necessarily obliged to be free traders if they could find a way to pay the expenses of the Government without the imposition of import duties.

In my younger days I was taught that the difference between the tariff policies of the Republican and Democratic Parties was that the former believed in a tariff for protection with incl-

dental revenue, while the latter believed in a tariff for revenue with incidental protection.

That was the accepted definition of the tariff views of the opposing parties then.

Of course every tariff levied for revenue purposes solely gives just as much protection to the home article to the extent of the duty imposed on the foreign article as if it had been levied for protective purposes.

Personally I believe in a tariff for revenue but not in a tariff for revenue only, because if I believed in a tariff for revenue only, I must dismiss from my mind any consideration whatever for the help of citizens of my own country against those of foreign countries, in so far as the application of the tariff policy is concerned, and that I can not bring my mind to consent to.

I believe in imposing a moderate duty on all articles of foreign manufacture that come in competition with articles of home manufacture, a duty just high enough to enable the American producer to make a reasonable profit through the exercise of diligent and intelligent application to his business, but not high enough to permit extortion or create monopoly by destroying competition.

I do not wish to see foreigners given an advantage over Americans, and, if necessary, I do not object to giving a little more for an American than for a foreign-made article, for I do not feel that I am losing anything by helping American people to live, whether they be farmers, manufacturers, or factory workers.

Of course this doctrine should not apply where conditions of production in this country are such that the duty would lay too heavy a burden on the people of this country.

The rule of reason should prevail, but such arguments against protection per se as "raising bananas in hothouses" and "raising bananas or lemons in Maine" have no application.

I do not know whether the doctrine I have just enunciated makes me liable to the charge of being a protectionist, but if being willing to see tariff duties levied on foreign articles that will help Americans and particularly American workingmen to live decently and respectably makes me a protectionist, then I can say that I am neither ashamed nor afraid to wear the name.

Under the principles I have enunciated, sugar is one of the proper articles on which to levy a revenue duty which will also permit it to succeed in this country in competition with the foreign product, under the moderate protection thus given, and, indeed, if no sugar at all was produced in this country it would still be a proper article to tax under the Democratic theory of taxation.

I insert here an editorial from Henry Watterson's paper, the Louisville Courier-Journal, of 11th April, entitled "Tariff on sugar, true Democratic usage":

Sugar is conceded the world over to be the ideal revenue producer. In all countries and everywhere it is both a necessity and a luxury. There is not a man, woman, or child in America that does not consume sugar in some form, whether in necessities, such as tea, coffee, drugs, medicines, and canned foods, or in luxuries, such as cakes, desserts, pastries, confectionery, cordials, chewing gum, and the like. Sugar is consumed in greater quantities by the well-to-do than by the poor. A tax on sugar is therefore the fairest, squarest, most equitable, and just tax that can be levied. Its effects are felt least by the poor, and its burdens, if any, are borne by the rich.

These are the very considerations that induced the English Parliament to reject this year, by a decisive vote, after full debate, a proposition to remove the duty on sugar, the friends of the proposition urging the abolition of the duty on the same grounds urged here—that it was a necessary of life and would reduce the cost of living.

We all know that Col. Watterson is one of the ablest and most consistent advocates of the Democratic theory on the tariff, and no smell of protection has ever adhered to his garments.

No Democrat will dispute the correctness of the statement.

Then, why will the Democratic Party depart now from its true principles, for the hope of gaining a temporary political success? It may receive present benefit, but I believe it will receive permanent injury by its departure from political principle, and in this case from political morality as well.

Why should the Democratic Party, with its revenue tariff record, sacrifice the great revenue from sugar while obtaining a less revenue through protection of other articles not nearly so legitimate a source of revenue as sugar, and which are also necessities of life, as clothing, for example?

For this bill does give protection to some manufacturers, and it is not denied.

I find no fault with that, for I wish them to live, and the Democratic platform promised that revision should be gradual.

What I protest against is the observance of the platform promise with respect to some articles and a violation of it with regard to this great industry of Louisiana.

No other State has been so discriminated against.

Coal is the principal production of West Virginia, but free coal will not close a single mine in that State; and coal was put on the free list last year on the motion of a West Virginia Senator, himself one of the largest coal operators of the State.

Zinc is a very large and very important mineral industry of Missouri, but free zinc or free lead will not begin to injure Missouri as free sugar will Louisiana.

Sugar is the most important agricultural interest of Colorado at the present time, but the destruction of it in Colorado will not disastrously injure one-third of the people that it will in Louisiana, where the people of one-half of the State directly or indirectly are dependent on its prosperity for their own, and where the other half will feel the bad results for years, due to diminished revenues to support the State expenses, resulting from decrease of values.

I have no hesitation in declaring that as an economic proposition the people of Louisiana can far better afford to live under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill than have the sugar industry of the State destroyed.

There is not a Senator in this body who, if his State was as disastrously affected by this bill as Louisiana is, would vote for it.

He may say now he would and he may think now he would, but if he was put to the test he would shrink back and refuse to do it. If he did not, in my opinion at least, he would not be worthy to represent his State.

The destruction of the sugar industry of this country would not only greatly injure Louisiana for a long time, but the results would be seriously felt in other States.

I doubt if any one industry in this country has greater ramifications throughout its length and breadth or sets in operation more wheels of commerce in more States of the Union than does the sugar industry of Louisiana.

I have with me a statement, which I will show to any Senator desiring to see it, of the list of supplies purchased and used in the erection of a sugar factory on Georgia plantation, at Mathews, in the parish of Lafourche, La., and where they were manufactured.

I will not encumber the Record by giving a list of these articles, but 14 States contributed to their manufacture, viz, Alabama, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

And what is true of the cane-sugar factories of Louisiana in this respect is also true of the beet-sugar factories of the West.

I also have a statement, which I will show to any Senator desirous of seeing it, giving the list of supplies used in the cultivation of Georgia plantation, which I will not enumerate here, but will state they were furnished by 18 States, viz, Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin; the mules, I may add, being furnished exclusively by the free-sugar State of Missouri and the half free-sugar State of Kentucky.

And, of course, the water and rail transportation of the country are utilized in bringing to the factory site from those various States all the supplies needed for its erection and maintenance and bringing to the plantation all the supplies necessary for its cultivation and carrying from it all of its yearly produce.

Can any other industry be found which contributes more generally to the prosperity of other States of the Union? And this is the industry which has been fostered by the tariff policy of the Democratic Party from its birth and which the same party now seeks to destroy from the face of the earth.

This factory of which I have spoken cost about \$400,000 to bring to its present state of efficiency, and three years from now, after it shall have manufactured its last crop of cane, its value will have been practically destroyed, for its complicated and costly machinery can not be used for other purposes and will bring only the price for which it will sell as old junk.

And what is true of this particular sugar factory in Louisiana in this respect is true of the 200 other factories in that State, aggregating some \$40,000,000 in value, for it is true, as was said by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the floor of this Chamber on the 15th day of last May, speaking of the effect of free sugar on Louisiana:

I am perfectly willing to admit that free sugar will dismantle every sugar house in Louisiana. I know it as well as my name is John Williams.

And this confiscation of property and the resultant bankruptcy of so many, which will be its effect, is wrought by the Democratic Party, while the people of my stricken State look despairingly on while they are being slaughtered in the house of those who should be their friends.

Oh! the pity of it; oh! the shame of it!

I do not say the people of Louisiana who are directly or indirectly dependent on the sugar industry for their livelihood will never recover from this cruel and needless blow, for such is not my belief.

But they must tread the paths of adversity for long years to come while struggling to adapt themselves to the new situation, and many who have lived in comfort will die in poverty.

But in all this land there are no more courageous or resourceful men, no more devoted or self-sacrificing women, than those of my own dear native State of Louisiana.

They have proved these traits of their character time and again in the past, through the direful stress of war and pestilence and flood, and they will continue to prove them in the future.

They may be stricken to the earth for a time by this blow dealt in utter disregard of their rights, but they will rise again through the inherent virtues of their proud and self-reliant natures.

I owe to these people of my State a far higher measure of devotion than I owe to the Democratic Party.

They sent me here, relying on my plighted word given before my election, that in such an extremity as that with which I am now confronted my duty to my State would outweigh my duty to my party.

I told them after my election that they who had placed their trust in my word would never be able to say that their trust had been misplaced.

Honor and duty alike demand that I vote against this bill while it embodies the provision denounced by the State Democratic convention of Louisiana that met in June of 1912 as "a heavy and cruel blow against Louisiana."

And I repeat here and now what I said to the Legislature of Louisiana on the 5th day of December, 1910: "If my mother must be stabbed, some other hand than mine must be found to wield the knife." God helping me, I will stand by my word and by my people to the end.

Mr. GRONNA obtained the floor.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is going to discuss this bill largely from the standpoint of the vast agricultural interests of the country, I think we should have more Senators here than are now present; and so I raise the question of the lack of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Page	Smoot
Bankhead	Hollis	Penrose	Sterling
Brady	James	Poindexter	Stone
Bandeggee	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Sutherland
Bristow	Jones	Ransdell	Thomas
Bryan	Kenyon	Robinson	Thompson
Burton	Kern	Saulsbury	Thornton
Catron	La Follette	Shafroth	Tillman
Chamberlain	Lane	Sheppard	Townsend
Chilton	Lea	Sherman	Vardaman
Clapp	Lewis	Shields	Warren
Colt	Martin, Va.	Shively	Weeks
Crawford	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Williams
Cummins	Norris	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, Md.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. CATRON. Just a moment, if the Senator please. I wish to give notice that on to-morrow, after the close of morning business, I shall address the Senate on the tariff question.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I proceed at this time to a general discussion of the tariff bill. Were it not for the fact that the chief industry of the State which in part I have the honor to represent is most vitally and, as I believe, injuriously affected, I would at this time forego the privilege of addressing the Senate; but I desire to call attention to the fact, which I believe I can demonstrate, that the United States, the greatest commercial nation of the earth, will be among the few nations capable within their own borders of producing a sufficient amount of foodstuff to supply their own needs to discriminate against the agricultural industry. So, I say at the outset that I shall try to show that, with the exception of one or two important nations and two smaller nations, the United States will be the only great commercial nation which discriminates against this legitimate industry.

Mr. President, the tariff bill now under consideration has been framed by the members of a party which has proclaimed its belief that protection as a policy is unjustifiable and that the imposition of tariff duties in order to encourage

domestic industries is an unconstitutional exercise of power by Congress. At the same time the spokesmen of that party have not followed their line of reasoning to its logical conclusion and declared for free trade, either now or in the future, but have insisted that they favor a tariff for revenue. Whether they are able to see a difference between a tariff when it is levied by a party believing in protection as a policy and that same tariff when levied by a party which denies a belief in that policy, or whether the denial that they favor free trade has been made because they feared the possible political consequences, I shall not undertake to say. To be consistent the party should, in repudiating protection, have declared for free trade, either immediately or by a gradual scaling down of duties, because a tariff system similar to that of England is the only one which will not be protective to a greater or less extent, depending on the rates of duty imposed. Merely calling a tariff a revenue tariff or a protective tariff does not change its nature. Whether it is the one or the other depends on what articles the duties are levied on. If a duty is levied on any article which is produced in this country, it gives the producer of that article an advantage in the markets of this country over the producers of other countries, and to the extent of this advantage it is a protective tariff, and it is protective to the same extent whether found in an avowed protective-tariff measure or in one alleged to be for revenue only.

It has been stated that this tariff bill is a competitive-tariff bill as distinct from a protective-tariff bill; that these rates are competitive instead of protective. I have not noticed, however, that anyone has undertaken to explain just what a competitive-tariff rate is as used in this bill. If it is meant that these rates will permit more or less competition on the part of foreign manufacturers and producers with domestic manufacturers and producers—in other words, that these rates are not prohibitive—then there is no reason why these rates should be called competitive rates any more than the rates of other bills, because while some of the rates in former tariff bills may have been prohibitive, most of them have not, as our imports evidence. If, on the other hand, it is meant to imply that the rates in this bill are such as will permit foreign and domestic producers to compete in our markets on equal terms, then, so far as the principle is concerned, this bill is as much a protective-tariff bill as any which has preceded it. The principle would be the same, namely, that because of different conditions abroad the domestic producer needs a certain amount of protection in order to place him on equal terms with his foreign competitor; and the lower rates in this bill would not be due to its being framed on a different principle but to the fact that its framers considered less protection necessary than the framers of former bills did. There may be those who will explain that competitive rates are such as will invite competition from abroad whenever the domestic producers attempt to raise the prices too high. The fact is, however, that any rates which are not prohibitive will invite competition from abroad whenever domestic prices are high enough so that it will be a profitable venture for foreign producers to ship their goods to this country. If a competitive-tariff rate is such a rate that when a foreign producer imports an article to this country and sells it for the same price as the domestic producer, and his profit, after paying the tariff duty, is exactly equal to that of the domestic producer, then a competitive-tariff rate is merely a protective-tariff rate under a different name, because all that the domestic producer is entitled to under the principle of protection is a rate which will measure the difference of the cost of producing the same article to him and his foreign competitor.

I believe it has also been stated that this is solely a revenue measure, drafted with a view to raising revenue for the Government and with no regard to whether or not it will afford protection to any industry. If this is true, if the sole purpose of this bill is to raise revenue, if no advantage is to be given to any producer or set of producers because of tariff duties levied by this bill, then, to be consistent, on every article produced in this country and protected by a tariff duty, whether that tariff is called a revenue duty or something else, there should be placed an internal-revenue duty equal in amount to the benefit derived by the producer of that article from the tariff on it. And if the Democratic position is correct, if no encouragement should be given to industries by means of tariff duties, and, further, if tariff duties result in increasing the price in this country to the full amount of the duty, and if the higher rate of wages in this country is not in any way dependent on the tariff duties, and if, as is contended, the profits from a protective tariff go wholly into the pockets of the producers, then it would be the duty of the framers of this measure to place an internal-revenue tax on such articles. If the Democrats are correct in assuming that the American producer can produce his

products just as cheaply as the foreign producer, then there is no excuse for a Democratic Congress, if it finds it necessary in order to raise revenue to place tariff duties on articles produced in this country, for failing to place an internal-revenue tax on the articles produced here in order that the producer of them may not, because of the necessity of raising revenue for the Government, enjoy an advantage which other producers do not. If the Democratic position is the correct one, you can not either explain or excuse the imposition of the high rates on silk manufactures on the ground that they are necessary in order to raise revenue and that such manufactures are luxuries bought by such as can afford to pay the enhanced prices. If those articles can be manufactured as cheaply here as abroad, and if the imposition of the tariff duties results in increasing the prices of those articles, then you are simply putting that much more money into the pocket of the producers of those articles, and the mere fact that most of these products are bought by rich persons who can afford to pay these prices does not change the principle; the only just thing to do would be to place an internal-revenue tax on the manufactures of silk equal in amount to the tariff duty, thereby increasing the revenue to the Government and collecting such increase from those who can afford to pay it. As raw silk is admitted free there would be no need of a compensatory duty.

I have no wish, however, to be unfair to the framers of this bill. The rates contained therein are for the most part very much lower than those in the present law, although it appears to me that the reductions have been very unevenly made. I apprehend that in framing the bill consideration was had of what reductions in duties could be made without injuring the industries benefited by the present duties. I can understand how an irreconcilable free trader in drafting a tariff bill for a country that had enjoyed a protective tariff for a number of years would be careful in reducing the various rates in order that the different industries might adjust themselves to the changed duties with as little inconvenience as possible and in order that there might be no industrial depression because of such tariff revision, even if he considered protective tariff duties on principle indefensible. Indeed, unless the last campaign was carried on by the Democrats on a pretense, I do not see how the members of the majority in this Congress can avoid taking these facts into consideration. It was stated authoritatively in the campaign last fall that the Democratic tariff revision would be undertaken in such a way that no "legitimate" industry would be injured. If the question of whether the reduction of duties will or will not injure any industry has not been considered in the framing of this measure, then the Democrats are as guilty of breaking campaign pledges as they would have been if they had failed to revise the tariff at all. It appears to me that it is just as necessary and just as proper to discuss this bill in the light of its probable effect on our industries as if it had been frankly a protective tariff measure, and that if it is found that certain rates, or the reduction of rates, injures an industry, or gives those engaged in one industry an undue advantage over those engaged in others, it is no defense to say that the bill is framed as a revenue measure merely.

Aside from the character of this bill, I can not say that I can indorse the way in which this measure has been drafted and the way in which it is being passed. It is my belief, and has been for a long time, that in the enacting of tariff legislation the services of some kind of tariff commission are necessary. We should have a commission or body which would not only conduct hearings the way committees of Congress do, but which would actually examine the books of the industries which claim they are in need of protection, and thus determine, or at least aid in determining, what industries will survive a reduction or removal of tariff duties, and in cases where it is found that tariff duties are necessary, if the industry is to prosper, what rate of duty is necessary. With such facts before us we could then proceed to consider the bill with a clear view of its consequences, and instead of trying to determine with inadequate means what the probable effect of the proposed changes will be we could accept the conclusions of the tariff commission as to the effect of reducing the rates to a certain point, or removing them entirely, and consider the other question of whether or not the policy as applied to the different industries was a wise one, whether a certain industry which it was found could not subsist without a certain rate of duty was of such importance and the carrying on of it of such benefit that this would more than outweigh the increased cost of its product which might result from the retention of that duty. Balancing the advantage of having the industry operate in this country against the disadvantage of a possible higher cost to the consumer, each Member of the Senate and of the House could then cast his vote accordingly as he believed that one outweighed

the other. At present, with a mass of testimony and statements all of which no Senator or Member can take time to read, and as to which he has no means of knowing to what extent they may be prejudiced and biased, with authoritative statements lacking as to conditions both at home and abroad, with limited time, the individual Members of the Senate and of the House can no more than scratch the surface of the vast subject, and tariff bills are framed on what is little better than guesswork.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions, if it will not interrupt him or interfere with his argument.

Mr. GRONNA. It will not. I shall be glad to answer them if I can.

Mr. CLAPP. Is there any question at all but that under the conditions existing to-day there should be some protection upon wheat, for instance?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I think it was clearly shown in the Senate and before the Committee on Finance during the time the reciprocity treaty was pending that the tariff had benefited the farmer to the extent of an average of about 11 cents a bushel since 1905.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I will ask the Senator if, in his judgment, any commission could make that fact any plainer than it is to-day?

Mr. GRONNA. Speaking of a commission, I favor that, as a general proposition, to handle all tariff matters.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; so do I. What I want to get at, however, is this: I am in favor of a commission; but even if we had a commission, and the system were still maintained of three or four men in a party committee getting a majority of that committee in accord with them and then making their bill a party measure, whipping a party into line, and absolutely standing against the most reasonable amendment on earth that might be suggested, we would still have no remedy. Is not the evil in the system by which tariff bills are framed and whipped through Congress through committee, caucus, and appeals to party loyalty?

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I wanted to make plain.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While I agree with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], yet I think it is only fair to say that the report made by the Tariff Board, which was legislated out of existence last year, furnished very valuable information in relation to the market price of wheat, the value of the lands in different parts of Canada, and the cost of labor in different parts of Canada, as compared with the cost of labor in the several States of the Union. It was also very valuable in the way of throwing light upon the difference in the situation in the production of barley, in the production of wheat, in the production of flax, and the products made from these cereals, as between Winnipeg and Minneapolis and as between the Maritime Provinces and the Eastern States.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes. If the Senator from North Dakota will pardon me for a moment longer—I want no misunderstanding as to my attitude—I believe there should be a tariff commission; but the report that was then made by the tariff commission was absolutely ignored under the force of the party lash, and the bill went through; and notwithstanding the existence of that report, to suggest an amendment in consonance with the report was to be charged with having the purpose of assassinating the pending bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator is right about that.

Mr. CLAPP. You may have tariff commissions, and I believe in them, and as long as I am in the Senate I am going to fight to get a tariff commission, but that will not remedy the situation if there is maintained the system which permits of two or three men getting a majority of the majority side of a committee, and then pronouncing their verdict as a test of party loyalty and whipping a bill through under that sort of inspiration, permitting no change, no matter how plain the necessity for the amendment may be.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] is correct in his statement that the Tariff Commission made such a report. I intend to quote verbatim from part of that report relating to the cost of various products in the United States and in Canada.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask if the Senator also believes, in the event that wheat is placed on the dutiable list, that flour ought to carry some compensatory or corresponding duty?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it should. I am frank to say that I do not believe the producer of wheat would get the benefit of the duty on wheat unless a compensatory duty were put on flour.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that in view of the fact that the Senator comes from a large wheat-producing area of the United States, much larger than the part of the country I come from; but we have very large milling interests that take a very great volume of your wheat, and a large part of it is not used for domestic consumption, but is for the export trade.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe that is correct.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, as I know he wants to finish to-day.

Mr. GRONNA. I gladly yield to the Senator from Iowa, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. In answer to the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], the Senator suggested a proposition that is interesting to me, and I want to ask him about it, because I know he has superior knowledge on matters pertaining to agriculture.

Does the Senator believe the tariff on wheat increases the amount per bushel that the producers of wheat receive?

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator ask me that question, or the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KENYON. I understood the Senator from North Dakota, in answer to the Senator from Minnesota, to say that it did.

Mr. GRONNA. I made the statement, Mr. President, that I believed it was shown to the Committee on Finance and to the Senate, at the time the reciprocity treaty was pending, that unquestionably the tariff on wheat benefited the farmer to a certain extent; but I will say that so far as wheat is concerned, I do not believe it has ever benefited the farmer to the full extent of the duty.

Mr. KENYON. But has the Senator preached the doctrine in his State to the farmer who raises wheat that a tariff on farm products increases the price to the producer to the extent of the tariff? Has it not always been said, rather, that the tariff on farm products, or, rather, the general tariff system, benefited the farmer only in the incidental benefit that came from the general prosperity of the country?

I have never, except in recent years, heard it preached that the tariff on oats or corn or wheat increased the price to the producer.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, as I understand, whenever there is a surplus of a commodity, especially an agricultural product which no monopoly can control, it must be obvious to anyone that the price of that product, to a certain extent, will be based upon the world's price. But I do say, and I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction by anybody, that for the last six or seven years the farmers of the United States have profited to a considerable extent by the duties on farm products.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota again yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will ask the Senator with reference to two cereals that are largely produced in his State and also in the State which I, in part, represent, and in the great Northwest generally, whether or not it is a fact that instead of exporting a surplus of those cereals we consume all we produce and import largely of them? I refer to barley, which supplies the great breweries in the United States, and to flaxseed, the oils from which are an important farm product, or the result of the farm product. Is not the question of the world's market price excluded in that case, and is it not a fact that the price is affected by the tariff because we consume our whole supply in this country and import instead of exporting it?

Mr. GRONNA. We consume more and more the products of the farm; and it seems to me such a plain and simple proposition that it must be easily understood by everybody.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not that particularly true of flax and barley, two staple products of the farm?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it is; but before I go into that subject I want to answer the question of the Senator from Iowa, which deserves considerable attention.

Take the case of corn, a product which is produced very largely in the State of Iowa. No one will contend, I suppose,

that those who produce corn have benefited to the amount of the duty of 15 cents per bushel on corn; but if we look up the statistics we find that practically no corn is exported. It is fed to the live animals of this country, and in this very bill it is proposed to take off all the duty on those animals. While the farmer does not receive a direct benefit from the duty on corn, as the Senator from Iowa has said, I believe he does get the benefit from the tariff on the animals to which the corn may be fed.

Mr. KENYON. Not under this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Not under this bill; no. There is no tariff on those things in this bill, as I am going to show later on.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

Mr. GRONNA. I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska in a minute.

In response to the question asked me by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], I invite the Senator's attention to the price of flax during the fall of 1910 and the following winter and summer. During that time there were more than 10,000,000 bushels of flax imported into this country, paying the full duty. There was a shortage in the production of flax, and consequently flax went to the enormous price of more than \$2 a bushel. I know that no Senator will deny that at that time and on that particular product the farmers did receive the full benefit of the duty of 25 cents a bushel on flax.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that it was conclusively shown, when the reciprocity bill was up, that the tariff upon wheat benefited the farmer to the extent of about 11 cents per bushel.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I believe it was.

Mr. JONES. That was a direct benefit to the farmer from the tariff?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I believe so. That is my belief.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator from North Dakota believe that if the tariff on wheat were a direct benefit to the producer to the extent of the tariff, thereby increasing the cost of bread to the consumers of the country, any such tariff duty would stand?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe not.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator believes not?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe not; but I think I did show—and I know other Senators showed, and proved conclusively—that the price of wheat was not the cause of the high price of bread. I do not believe anyone will contend that a loaf of bread will be sold any cheaper whether wheat is worth 50 cents a bushel or 75 cents a bushel or a dollar a bushel. In the nineties wheat was sold for less than 50 cents a bushel, and yet the same price was paid for a loaf of bread.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not want the Senator to leave the subject of wheat, to which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] had called his attention, without explicitly stating the benefit that would come to the producer of wheat on account of the tariff on wheat, although I think probably the Senator has fully answered it. I wanted to suggest, however, that as we approached the time when we consumed all the wheat we produced, the benefit received by the farmer who raised wheat continued to increase. While the Senator says, and says correctly, that although the tariff on wheat was 25 cents a bushel the farmer did not get the full benefit of it, the reason was, as illustrated by the tariff on barley and flax, that we were not consuming all of the wheat we produced.

I believe it is conceded that if we did not consume any wheat the tariff would not do any good; but if we consumed all the wheat we produced, the benefit received by the producer would be measured by the tariff itself. Those are the two extremes.

It has been demonstrated over and over again from statistics—and the Senator from Iowa can easily look it up and demonstrate for himself—that on an average, taking the price of wheat on one side of the line in the United States and the price of wheat on the other side of the line, in some instances just across the street—for instance, in the case of Portal—there has been a difference of more than 11 cents most of the time, going up as high as 15 cents, where it was shipped on the same railroad, to the same market, perhaps in the same car, or at least in the same train. There has been that difference in the price when there was no difference in freight rates—all the conditions being the same—the wheat being raised in the one case on the Canadian side and in the other case on the Dakota side of the line. I think it has been demonstrated, whatever the theories may be, that that is the fact. It was also demonstrated here the other day by the Senator from

North Dakota that the same thing held true in regard to the price of wheat in Minneapolis and in Liverpool, for instance.

But I am reminded that I am taking up too much of the time of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree that the facts are as stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GRONNA. Just a moment and then I will yield. I want to be perfectly fair, and I do not intend to make any misstatements. Of course, I am now expressing only my own belief.

During the year 1912 the United States produced 730,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is more wheat than we can consume. As a natural consequence the price of wheat went down. Unlike the manufacturer, the farmer does not control the price of his product. The farmer brings his product to the so-called elevators, and the price is fixed by the buyers. When there is an overproduction of wheat it is but natural that the price to the farmer will be fixed to a certain extent by the world's price. But it has been demonstrated over and over again that when consumption equals or very nearly equals production, the farmer receives the benefit of the tariff on his products as well as the manufacturer receives the benefit of the tariff on his products.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, in order to complete the assertion and demonstration which the Senator from North Dakota has made about the price of a loaf of bread, I wish to ask him if the size of a loaf is the same now as it was in the nineties, the time to which he refers?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in my home we practice economy, and we always bake our own bread. I wish the Senator from Massachusetts would put some other witness on the stand to answer his question. I am hardly a competent witness.

Mr. WEEKS. I did not know but that the Senator had looked up the matter and had found that the loaf of bread which is usually sold by bakers to-day is the same size that it was 10 or 15 years ago. I think it is. I did not know but that the Senator could answer that question.

Mr. GRONNA. No; I do not know as to that. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts knows more about it than I do.

I desire to finish my speech to-day, and for that reason I should like to proceed. I shall say some things about the Democrats this afternoon, but it is with charity and in the hope that they will profit by what I may say.

Further, I do not believe in legislating by means of a caucus. We are elected to come to the Capital and legislate according to our own views of what will be for the benefit of the people of this country, and no one has a right to surrender his views, either to a secret caucus or to any individual, however prominent. If a person votes for or against a measure contrary to his own convictions, I do not see how the fact that a party caucus had passed on that measure can change circumstances or can relieve that Member from his responsibility, and I do not believe the people of this country will consider that it does relieve him of the responsibility. Moreover, the debates in caucus are behind closed doors, the deliberations are secret. The people are given no information as to what reasons are advanced for or against any proposal, or what considerations governed in the enactment of a certain measure. The people have a right to know not only what their representatives do, but also why they do it. This is the reason why it is a fundamental principle of our Government that debates of legislative bodies shall be open to the public, and it appears to me that legislating in secret conclave is just as much fraught with danger when done by the majority party of the Senate as it would be if done by the two parties jointly.

While there may be a question, however, as to on just what principle this bill has been based, there is one feature that is immediately noticeable, and that is its discrimination against the farmer. Why it should be necessary to cut the duties which may benefit him lower than those that benefit the manufacturer has not been made plain by those responsible for this bill; why it should be necessary to remove the duties on his products while retaining the duties on manufactures has not been explained. Agriculture is fundamentally the most important of our industries. It is absolutely necessary to have food, while we can at a pinch do without the products of many other industries. It does not appear to me to be farsighted statesmanship to discriminate against such an industry. Almost without exception the other nations attempt to give the farmer the same benefits from their tariffs that they give the manufacturer and to place no burdens on him not also placed on others.

We have in former years followed the same course, and while the farmer may not have profited as much from the protective

policy as those engaged in other industries, that was because of the conditions of the industry; because of the fact that in former years the prices of our farm products were not fixed in our home markets to the same extent as at present. Now, however, certain classes are apparently becoming afraid that the farmer will benefit from protection to a greater extent than formerly, and it is therefore proposed to make him sell his products entirely in a competitive market while still making him buy what he consumes in a protected market. The Democrats have very generally maintained, especially when campaigning in the agricultural sections, that the farmer derives no benefit from the duties on his products; but from the reasons that have been advanced for the placing of his products on the free list it is evident that there is a belief that the duties on those products will serve to enhance their prices. If that is not the reason, then why the talk of a "free market basket"? And why the statement that it is the policy of the Democrats to remove the tariff on food products, which are a basic necessity? If removing the tariff on these products is not going to lower their price, then why the pretense of that being the purpose of the reduction? And if it is going to lower the price, how can it be maintained that the producer of those products is not benefited by the tariff on them? Our Democratic friends appear to have got into this difficulty by having two sets of reasons why the tariff should be removed from farm products inconsistent with each other, using the one or the other as the occasion might seem to demand, and now attempting to use both at the same time. If the removal of the tariff on farm products is going to give the consumer cheaper foods, then the tariff on those products gives the producer a better market, and the producer is benefited by it. On the other hand, if, as has been contended, the tariff on farm products is of no benefit to the producer of them, it can only be because the tariff does not increase the price of those products; and if it does not increase the price, then where is there any excuse for stating that the removal of the tariff is going to benefit the consumer and give him cheaper food?

But, while it must be true that if the consumer is to get his food cheaper by the removal of the duties on farm products the tariff on those products must be of some benefit to the producer of them, the converse is not necessarily true, and it does not follow that because the tariff on his products is of benefit to the farmer that the removal of that tariff will give the consumer his food cheaper or benefit him in any way. Because of the many hands through which the farmer's product passes before it reaches the ultimate consumer, it is more than probable that in most cases the consumer will not profit from the lower price which the farmer will receive for his product. For instance, I do not suppose that anyone will contend that the price of a loaf of bread will be reduced by the removal of the duty on wheat.

In discriminating against the farmer in the levying of tariff duties, the Democrats are adopting a policy which is not pursued by any other nation which is capable of producing enough food within its own borders for its people. Even England, which has for a long time been dependent on other countries for its food supplies, does not discriminate against its agriculturists. It is true that they have to sell their products in competition with the entire world, but they also have the privilege of making their purchases in a competitive market. If it has been the intent of the Democrats to approach as nearly as possible the tariff system of England, they have overlooked this fact: While England has the benefit of a protective policy to a certain extent, it does not give this benefit to one class of producers by discriminating against another class. They receive this benefit because of the preferential tariff duties of the English colonies. Canada has three rates of duty on most articles—the general tariff, the intermediate tariff, and the British preferential tariff. The general is the highest rate, the intermediate the next lower, and the British preferential the lowest. Imports from the United States pay the general rate. By special trade agreements countries may get the benefit of the intermediate rate.

With few exceptions, the British preferential rate is only from 50 to 75 per cent of the general rate, thus giving the British producer a protection equal to from 25 to 50 per cent of that enjoyed by their own producers. In many cases articles dutiable when imported from other countries are admitted free from England, thus giving the British producer of these articles the same protection as the Canadian producer. In the same way, on articles imported into Australia the British producer is given a lower rate, the rate being in most cases from 50 to 80 per cent of the rates assessed against the same goods imported from other countries. New Zealand has a similar system, charging a surtax in some cases as high as a hundred per cent on articles imported from other foreign countries over

that charged on the same articles imported from British dominions. In most cases this surtax is from 20 to 50 per cent. In other words, a producer in this country, for instance, exporting an article to New Zealand has to pay a duty from 20 to 50 per cent higher than the British producer exporting the same article. While the English manufacturers thus have the benefits of protection given them by the English colonies, it is to be noted that there is no burden falling on the English farmer because of this protection. He can still purchase whatever he needs in a competitive market. The Democrats, however, propose to make the farmer in this country sell his products in a competitive market and make his purchases in a protected market; they aim to give him no better market for his products than the British producer has, and by retaining a tariff on the products of other industries compel him to make his purchases in a higher market than the English farmer.

The report of the Finance Committee gives the average rate of duty in the agricultural schedule of this bill as 15.21 per cent, while the average rate of the entire bill is 20.07 per cent. This method of comparison, however, does not disclose the real nature of the bill, since it does not show the number or importance of the products placed on the free list. As a matter of fact, it is misleading. The Senate bill carries a number of agricultural products on the free list on which the bill as it passed the House imposed a duty, and yet the comparison just referred to gives the average rate of duty of the agricultural schedule on the Senate bill as higher than in the House bill. The comparison simply gives the average duty of the schedule, and really shows little as to the real character of the bill. Products which the farmer has to sell which are on the free list in the pending bill and on which there formerly was a tariff are as follows:

Broom corn: The Payne Tariff Act provided for a duty of \$3 per ton.

Buckwheat and buckwheat flour: On buckwheat the Payne and Dingley rates were 15 cents per bushel; the Wilson Act provided for a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem. On buckwheat flour the rate in the Payne Act is 25 per cent ad valorem; in the Dingley and Wilson Acts it was 20 per cent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not like to interrupt the Senator, but I want to get one point clear at this stage of his remarks. Does he consider buckwheat flour and corn meal as manufactured products?

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Texas if he has been here during the time I have made my remarks on this bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have been; but I understood the Senator to be enumerating farm products that were put on the free list, and I wanted to understand if buckwheat flour is a manufactured product. I simply want the information; that is all.

Mr. GRONNA. I have just stated it. I am sorry the Senator did not hear my statement. I said on buckwheat the Payne and Dingley rates were 15 cents a bushel, and the Wilson Act provided for a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem; and that on buckwheat flour the rate in the Payne Act was 25 per cent ad valorem; and in the Dingley and Wilson Acts 20 per cent. I am simply reading a list of articles that are placed on the free list in this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thought the Senator was reading a list of farm products placed on the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. All these are farm products.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is not flour a manufactured product?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly, it is a manufactured product. I agree with the Senator on that. I think we all agree on that point. If we would have no more difficulty in disposing of this bill than that, I think it would be so changed before its passage that even the agricultural classes would get some benefit from it.

Corn: The duty under the Payne and Dingley Acts was 15 cents per bushel; under the Wilson Act 20 per cent ad valorem. On corn meal the Payne rate is 40 cents per 100 pounds; the Dingley rate was 20 cents per bushel; and the Wilson rate was 20 per cent ad valorem.

Eggs: The present rate is 5 cents per dozen; the Dingley rate was 5 cents; the Wilson rate 3 cents.

Flax straw: A duty of \$5 per ton under the Payne and Dingley Acts; free under the Wilson Act.

Hides: These were placed on the free list by the Payne bill and are retained there by the pending bill. The Dingley Act had a tariff of 15 per cent ad valorem on hides.

Milk: Rate under the Payne and Dingley Acts, 2 cents per gallon; under the Wilson Act, free.

Cream: Rate under the Payne Act, 5 cents per gallon; under the Wilson Act, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Potatoes: Rate under the Payne and Dingley Acts, 25 cents per bushel; under the Wilson Act, 15 cents per bushel.

Rye: Rate under the Payne and Dingley Acts, 10 cents per bushel; under the Wilson Act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Swine: Rate under the Payne and Dingley Acts, \$1.50 per head; under the Wilson Act, 20 per cent ad valorem. Twenty per cent ad valorem was really a higher rate than the rate of the present law.

Cattle: Payne and Dingley rates, less than 1 year old, \$2 per head; others valued at less than \$14 per head, \$3.75 each; if valued at more than \$14 per head, 27½ per cent ad valorem. Wilson rate, 20 per cent.

Sheep: Payne and Dingley rates, less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head; 1 year old or over, \$1.50 per head. Wilson rate, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Wheat: Under the Payne and Dingley Acts 25 cents per bushel; under the Wilson Act 20 per cent ad valorem.

Wool: Payne and Dingley rates, on wool of the first class, 11 cents per pound; on wool of the second class, 12 cents per pound; on wool of the third class, if valued at 12 cents per pound or less, 4 cents per pound; if valued at more than 12 cents, 7 cents per pound. Under the Wilson Act wool was free.

It is true that agricultural implements have been placed on the free list, but that does not alter the fact that this bill discriminates against the farmer, because the farmer purchases other things besides agricultural machinery. He is a consumer of the products of the other industries in this country, similarly as the producers of those other products are consumers of his products, and when you place a duty on those articles that he has to buy and place his products on the free list you are forcing him to sell his products in a free market in competition with the entire world, while compelling him to make his purchases in a protected market. While this bill as it stands contains great reductions in the duties on manufactures, it is a gross discrimination against the farmers, especially of the North and West.

This bill provides for a countervailing duty on wheat and wheat flour as against countries imposing duties on those products. I wish I could have the attention of those who have the countervailing duty in charge. I believe I am in a position to enlighten that subcommittee on this particular item. What it is expected to accomplish by this provision has not, so far as I have noticed, been explained by its authors. So far as the farmer is concerned, this provision is of no value. If it is pretended that by its means the farmer's market for wheat will be extended, it is a mere pretense and nothing more. The countries which find it to their interest to maintain a duty on wheat or on flour are those countries which have no wheat they want to sell us, which have no flour they want to sell us, and to which it consequently makes no difference whether or not we maintain a duty on wheat and flour. It does not affect them. Why, then, should the fact that we are willing to remove our duties on these products be any incentive to them to remove theirs? On the other hand, countries which have wheat they wish to export in any considerable quantity to this country—and this consideration applies especially to Canada—have no market for our wheat; they will, no doubt, very willingly remove their duties in return for our admission of their wheat free of duty. But will we really receive anything in return? The American farmer, whose market it is proposed to barter away, will receive nothing; Canada has no market for our wheat. It is a matter of supreme indifference to the American farmer whether he can ship wheat to Canada free of duty, because Canada has no market for it; Canada has a market for only a small part of its own production.

It is possible that some of our millers may be in a position to benefit if Canada should remove her duty on flour, but if they do, it will be at the expense of the American farmer; it will mean the sacrifice of the interests of the American farmer for the benefit of the Canadian farmer and the American miller. It also seems to me that it is possible to construe this proviso in such a manner as will permit Canada to ship her wheat to this country free, merely removing her duty on wheat and retaining her duty on flour. I believe under the provisions of this bill that will be possible. In that case no one will benefit from it except the Canadian wheat grower. It is the same old story of the Canadian reciprocity agreement over again in a slightly altered form, surrendering the market of the American farmer to the foreign producers and either getting nothing in return or something of benefit merely to the manufacturer. The aim is apparently to delude the farmer into believing that his interests are to be looked after, and that this countervailing duty is to be used to enlarge his foreign market for wheat by inducing foreign countries to remove their duties on wheat and flour. As a matter of fact, the proviso will do nothing of the kind. It will not make more accessible a single foreign wheat market, but it will in all probability make more accessible the American wheat market to the Canadian farmer and the wheat

growers of other countries who may care to avail themselves of the opportunity offered them. We place ourselves in the position of offering the American wheat market to the wheat growers of any country that may care to apply for it, and in return we secure nothing, because such countries as will avail themselves of this do not, nor will they ever expect to, have any market for our wheat. And as to the countries that might offer a market for our wheat, we offer them nothing that would be any inducement to them to open their markets. To those countries that export wheat and are anxious to enter our market we offer that market for nothing. From the countries to which we export wheat and flour and whose markets we are desirous of entering on more favorable terms, we ask that they admit our wheat and flour free, and we offer them nothing in return for the favor. We give favors gratuitously to some countries and then apparently expect that other countries will be equally shortsighted and give us favors, knowing that we will give them nothing in return. If we ask favors from certain countries, we should expect to grant them favors in return of somewhat approximately equal value. And when we grant favors we should take at least a little precaution to see that the assumed favors which we are to receive have a little value.

This provision, I presume, is offered in the nature of reciprocity. Reciprocity seems in recent years to have come to mean the surrender of the market of the American farmer to the farmers of other countries in return either for no benefits at all or else benefits merely to the manufacturers. The manner in which the removal of the duty on wheat would injure the American wheat grower I explained at length at the time when the Canadian reciprocity agreement was under discussion in the Senate two years ago; it has also been discussed by other Senators during the present session. I do not intend to go into it again at this time and will content myself with calling attention to a few facts having to do with the manner in which the free admission of Canadian wheat will affect our farmers. The wheat which is produced by the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota is northwestern hard spring wheat. It is distinct from the softer grades produced farther south either as spring or winter wheat and has superior milling qualities. The yield per acre is not so great as it is of winter wheat. In ordinary years none of this wheat is exported, all of it being consumed by American mills. I have also been told by millers that the flour made from this wheat is not exported, being consumed in this country. The wheat that figures in our export is the softer winter wheat, and also to some extent the wheat known as macaroni or durum wheat. The kind that Canada raises is the northwestern hard spring wheat, and the wheat that the Canadian wheat will compete with directly is that raised by the farmers in the three States above mentioned. The cost of raising a bushel of this wheat is less in Canada because the new lands there will produce larger crops than the older lands on this side of the line and because the land is cheaper than in the United States. The Tariff Board in its report on the Canadian reciprocity agreement made the following statement in regard to the land values in the two countries:

In the great farming States of Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois the values of farm lands are very much higher than in any of the Canadian Provinces. In Illinois and Iowa they are a little more than twice as high as in Ontario.

The increase of land values between 1900 and 1910 has been marked in both countries. In certain of the Provinces the rate of increase has been higher than in any of the States. The highest rates of increase in the States are found where the highest land values obtain, namely, in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa. But, on the other hand, Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worth noting that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

It is impossible to make any significant comparative study of land values in western Canada and those in the United States. Western Canada is a virgin region; railroad lands have been sold to settlers at low prices and on liberal terms of payment; the Government has given away millions of acres under a liberal homestead law. In Manitoba the value of land per acre is \$29, or \$7 less than in Minnesota and Michigan; but owing to the recent settlement of Manitoba, the rate of increase during the last 10 years is much greater than in those States.

The prices of occupied land in Saskatchewan and Alberta are \$22 and \$20, respectively.

The board further gave the farm prices for 1910 as follows: Minnesota, 94 cents per bushel; North Dakota, 90 cents; South Dakota, 89 cents; Manitoba, 80 cents; Saskatchewan, 69 cents; Alberta, a little less than 68 cents.

Mr. GALLINGER. That refers to wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. That refers to the price of wheat and is from the report of the Tariff Board. It proves conclusively that we were receiving more for our wheat than they were receiving in Canada.

The farm prices, of course, depend, among other things, on the distance from market, and the above, therefore, is perhaps

not a fair comparison of the market prices in the two countries. On comparing the markets at Minneapolis and Winnipeg the board found that in 1910 the price at Minneapolis was from 6½ cents to 12½ cents above that at Winnipeg. In 1909 it ranged from five-eighths cent to 24½ cents above the Winnipeg price.

The Canadian grain grower has for a number of years looked with hungry eyes at the American grain market, from which he has been barred by our tariff. That the reciprocity agreement did not go into effect was not the fault of the Canadian grain grower, but due to the efforts of other Canadians who do not produce grain and who did not care whether the Canadian grain growers secured entry to the American market. Other issues, which to us appear irrelevant, and fears which to us appear unfounded, were joined with the issue of reciprocity, and the result was its defeat. At this time, however, the privilege of entering the American market on equal terms with the American farmer is handed to them without asking anything in return which they will hesitate in granting. And who will profit from thus surrendering the American market? The millers will undoubtedly profit to the extent of securing cheaper wheat in ordinary years and under ordinary circumstances, and they may also profit by being in a position to compete with the Canadian millers for Canadian markets. The American farmer will not be benefited in any event, and will be damaged to the extent that his wheat market is invaded by Canadian wheat growers.

So far as the European markets or markets of Asia are concerned, where we have to ship our surplus of wheat and of wheat flour, the provision will not result in securing admission on more favorable terms to a single market, as none of the countries to the markets of which we would desire admission expect to ship us either wheat or wheat flour, and our retention of a countervailing duty on wheat and wheat flour is therefore a matter of indifference to them. Does anyone imagine that France, for instance, will remove her duties of 37 cents per bushel on wheat, or \$2.75 per barrel on flour, in return for our removing the duties on wheat and flour imported from France? As France does not expect to sell us either wheat or flour it is immaterial to her whether or not we have a duty on these products. Or can anyone see why our free admission of wheat and flour should be any inducement to Germany to remove her duties of 49 and 36 cents per bushel on wheat, or \$2.02 and \$1.10 per hundred pounds on flour? In quoting the two rates of duty I refer to the general duty and the conventional duty. Germany does not expect to sell us either wheat or flour and does not care in the slightest whether we have a duty on either or both. Or take the case of Japan. Can anyone conceive why our removal of the duties on wheat and flour as against Japan should be any incentive for that country to remove her duties of 29 cents per bushel on wheat and 70 cents per 100 pounds on flour? Is it not evident to everybody that the only countries that will take advantage of our willingness to admit wheat and wheat flour free of duty will be those countries that have wheat and flour which they wish to sell us—as, for instance, Canada—and that the countries where we find now, and would expect to find, a market for our wheat and wheat flour will be given no incentive to remove their duties? Are we not giving something for nothing in the one instance, with the apparent hope of receiving something for nothing in the other? And does anyone believe that any of those countries whose markets we are seeking will grant us any favors unless we grant them something in return?

If anyone expects that, I fear he is doomed to disappointment. In foreign countries the tariffs seem to be constructed with the idea of encouraging domestic industries, and the agricultural industry is well taken care of in most of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from North Dakota if Germany, France, and Japan have for many years in the past had those extremely high rates of duty on wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; they have had them for a number of years, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. And those high rates are fixed so as to encourage the domestic production and keep out the wheat of other countries which may have a surplus?

Mr. GRONNA. Absolutely, because both France and Germany produce a sufficient amount of wheat to supply food for their own people.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that what they are doing in those countries is along the same line on which we have been operating when we have had a duty on American wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Exactly; only their rates have been higher than our rates.

It apparently has never occurred to them what a great blessing it would be to their farmers to surrender their markets to such of their foreign competitors as care to indicate their willingness to accept them. If we wish to extend our market for wheat and flour in those countries by securing more favorable tariff rates, it would seem reasonable to believe that we would be more likely to obtain this by offering to reduce or remove the duties on some of the articles which those countries produce and export to this country. If we wish to secure the removal of the duties on wheat and flour imposed by Germany and Belgium, for instance, would it not be more effective to offer to remove the duties on zinc, which those countries export and the rates on which I note have been increased over the House rates, rather than to offer to remove our duties on wheat and flour? If we wish to secure better rates from France, why would it not be better to offer to remove the duties on silks or other goods that France is exporting rather than the duties which are of no earthly interest to her? If we really wish to extend our markets abroad by securing more favorable tariff rates, why not make offers meaning something to countries which can give us a market for our products, rather than throw our own markets open to countries which will give us nothing in return?

Mr. President, this is so absolutely contrary to the policy advocated by that great statesman, James G. Blaine, that I do not want anyone to believe or think that he can delude the American farmer and make him believe that this is reciprocity such as was advocated by that great statesman. It does not take a very wise man, it seems to me, to know that a nation, as an individual, if it wants to extend commerce or trade relations, must give something in return for what it expects to get. This countervailing duty is all a farce, and you will not be able, I say, to delude the American farmer and make him believe, because you have a provision in this bill for a countervailing duty, that you are treating him fairly. You are not; you know that. You are aware of it as much as I am, and if any of you are aware of it you are doing an injustice to the people engaged in a great legitimate industry.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator mean by that to say that he thinks the Democrats are consciously and intentionally doing the farmers an injustice?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, I am going to say a little later on that I do not really entertain the opinion that they consciously want to do the farmer an injustice.

Mr. STONE. But that is what the Senator says.

Mr. GRONNA. But I am also going to say, and I say now, that there are men in the Senate who know as much and more about the great American industry of agriculture than does President Wilson. I am going to say further that I believe there are Senators on this floor who know as much about the existing condition of the American farmer as does the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance. If I am mistaken in that, Mr. President, then the majority has knowingly done the farmer an injustice.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator mean to say that if he is mistaken in supposing that the President and the majority members of the Finance Committee know less about the farming industry than the Senator himself or some of his colleagues, therefore they are doing a willful injustice?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, if they knew as much about the industry as does your humble servant, who is now addressing the Senate, I do not believe they would place the farmer's products on the free list; and if they do know as much about it as does your humble servant, then it would appear to me they have not given the subject the consideration to which that great industry is entitled.

Mr. STONE. We give the farmer, so far as taxation goes, pretty much everything the farmer buys free of duty. We put practically everything the farmer uses in his industry on the free list. The things which he buys to eat and wear, the comforts and necessities, have been put on the free list or they have been very radically reduced. Does the Senator think that the farmer gets no compensation in that?

Mr. GRONNA. I mean in the course of my remarks to give the Democratic Party credit for having taken the duty off of farm machinery. I intend in my speech to give them credit for whatever they have done. I also intend to refer to the fact that in this bill the duties have been very substantially reduced on many articles.

Mr. STONE. Is not that good for the farmer?

Mr. GRONNA. I want to be fair, and I am trying to be fair with the Democratic Party. I can not give the Senator a categorical answer. I am going to try to explain it, if the Senator will only honor me by his presence.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Senator, then—

Mr. GRONNA. I shall try to enlighten the Senator on the subject.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is himself a farmer, and is largely interested in farming.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir; that is true; I am largely interested in farming.

Mr. STONE. I have heard the Senator say that several times.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. STONE. Now, being personally informed with regard to that industry and personally interested in it, I ask would the Senator have the products of his farm put on the protected list and at the same time put the things the farmers, the Senator's constituents, buy, and that he himself as a farmer must buy, plows, mowers, thrashing machines, and many other things, on the free list, and reduce to a low tariff rate other things that he consumes, and still leave what he produces on a high-tax basis? Is that the view of the Senator?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not entertain any such views, nor am I advocating them. I will say, since the Senator has alluded to the fact that personally I am a farmer, that I do not believe the Senator alludes to that with any motive whatever. I know he does not. If farming were an industry that could be a monopoly, I might refrain, as Senators sometimes do, from even voting on this schedule. But there are nearly 10,000,000 farmers engaged in the industry, and no man will contend that farming can ever be made a trust or a monopoly. I feel that I am only doing my duty, as the Senator is doing his duty to his constituents and to the people of the United States, when I call attention to what I believe is a great injustice to the farmer. I intend to show that with the exception of Russia there is no other country than the United States which produces within its borders a sufficient amount of food products for its own consumption which does not protect the industry of farming as well as the industry of manufacturing.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. An observation just made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] interests me very much. I repeat it in order to be sure that I understood him correctly.

Does the Senator from Missouri mean to say that he and his associates realize that by taking off the duty upon agricultural products they have caused a great loss to the American farmer, and in order to compensate him for that loss they have put on the free list certain things which the farmer uses, and have very greatly reduced the duties upon certain other things which the farmer uses? Is that practically the statement just made by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STONE. No, Mr. President. I think the farmers of the country have been treated with especial consideration in this bill. A number of agricultural products have been put on the free list—some absolutely, and some under what is called the countervailing duty.

I never have believed—and I would have to hear something more than I have yet heard to convince me—that a duty on farm products is a real benefit to the farmer, even under a protective tariff. I do not believe that is the case; but that is an argument which has been made and gone over very often, and this is not the occasion to enter upon it.

I do say, however, and I did say, and I meant to be understood as saying, that the farmers will receive a very great benefit under this bill if it becomes a law, as I think it will, by having their implements of industry practically all—as far as I recall now, I think I may say all—put on the free list; and not only the implements of their industry, but by having many things which they purchase for other uses put on the free list, and practically everything that they consume put at a very much lower rate of duty, thereby taking off of them the burden of taxation. I think these things are for the benefit of the farmer, and, taken as a whole, the farmer gets far more consideration than almost any other class of our people, so far as this bill goes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter upon an argument as to whether a duty upon agricultural products raises the price of those products or not. I shall not interrupt the admirable address of the Senator from North Dakota to enter upon a discussion of that subject. But I understood the Senator from Missouri to say, and I have heard it said a good many times here, that something especial had been done for the farmer, and that it had been done because the duties had been taken from the farmer's products. I thought the Senator from Missouri stated that proposition so

clearly that it ought to be emphasized, for I understood him to say: "It is true that we have taken the duties from the farmer's products; but we have made up the loss, and more than the loss, by taking off the duties upon something else which he uses."

Mr. STONE. Evidently the Senator did not mean to say just what he did say—that I have contended, or that anyone on this side has contended, that the farmer was benefited by taking off the duty on his products. I have not said that. I do not think he is injured by the removal of the duties, but I do not think it is a benefit to him. A thing may not hurt one, may not injure one, and yet at the same time may not be of any immediate or especial benefit.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was quite sure that when the Senator from Missouri was reminded of what he had said, as I heard it, he would at once retire to the old position which I fancy all of our friends upon the other side—

Mr. STONE. But I never said anything of that kind. I never said anything of that kind, and the Senator will not say I did.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator as saying so, and therefore I asked the question. Of course, I can do nothing more than appeal to the RECORD when it shall have been printed; and if it there appears that I totally misconceived the Senator, he will be vindicated. But I believe when he reads what he said he will find it bears the interpretation I have put upon it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I dislike very much to interrupt further the address of the Senator from North Dakota, but before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat I should like to have him be a little more specific. I understood him to say that it had been repeatedly declared on this side of the Chamber that the farmer, having been subjected to certain losses by reason of the removal of the duties on his products, an effort had been made to compensate him for such losses by the removal of the duties upon agricultural implements and otherwise. Can the Senator be a little more specific in respect to individual and time?

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, Mr. President, I do not think I am called upon to name Senators and name dates. I have heard this question debated now for four years or more. What I said with regard to that was my recollection and my interpretation of what I have heard a great many times. I heard it repeatedly stated during the time we were considering what was known as the farmers' free list last year. That, however, is a mere matter for appeal to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Let me inquire of the Senator, then, whether that took the duties off the farmer's products so that it could possibly be said that the other changes were in compensation therefor?

Mr. CUMMINS. It did not take the duties off the farmer's products as a whole.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the purpose of the removal of the duties on wheat and flour is not to extend our markets, but to reduce the cost of flour to the consumer, then the insertion of this provision is inexcusable. In that case the lower cost of flour, which is presumably what would be aimed at, would depend on the willingness of a foreign country to remove her own duties. If some of our duties have the effect of increasing the cost of living to such an extent that they should be removed, then the logical way would be to remove them without waiting, as is proposed, until other countries shall give their sanction to such action. If the cost of wheat and flour is so great in this country that it is necessary to place those commodities on the free list in order to bring relief to the consumer, then why is it necessary to wait until Canada gives her sanction, or some other country gives her sanction, before removing the duties? The proposal is as inexcusable, if the purpose is to reduce the cost of flour, as it is useless if its purpose is to extend our foreign markets for wheat and flour.

In examining the tariffs of other countries which expect to produce enough agricultural products for their consumption, or nearly so, I find that in the framing of their tariff laws attention is given to the welfare and prosperity of the farmer as well as of the manufacturer. Of course, in the case of England, that country frankly confessed years ago that it could not produce enough agricultural products for its own consumption, and it has no tariff on such products any more than on manufactures.

On cattle the present law provides for a tariff of \$2 per head if less than 1 year old, \$3.75 per head if more than 1 year old and valued at less than \$14 per head, and 27½ per cent if valued at more than \$14. The Senate bill proposes to place them on the free list. Now let us consider the tariffs

of other countries. England admits cattle free. France has a general duty of \$2.63 per 100 pounds, live weight, and a minimum duty of \$1.75 per 100 pounds. The general rate applies to imports from the United States. Germany has a general duty of \$1.94 per 100 pounds and a conventional duty of 86 cents per 100 pounds. The conventional rate applies to imports from the United States. Austria-Hungary has a rate of \$3.65 per head for young cattle, \$6.09 per head for cows, and \$12.18 per head for oxen. In the case of oxen there is a conventional rate of 87 cents per 100 pounds, live weight, which applies to imports from the United States. Belgium has a tariff of from 26 cents to 44 cents per 100 pounds, live weight, on cattle. The Netherlands admits cattle free. The general rates and conventional rates of Italy both range from \$1.54 to \$7.33 per head, with an additional tax, called a statistical tax, of 2 cents per head. The conventional rate applies to imports from this country. Spain assesses duties ranging from \$8.59 to \$15.44 per head on cattle, with lower duties ranging from \$6.76 to \$15.44 per head on imports from more favored nations. Russia admits cattle free. Our neighbor on the north—Canada—imposes an ad valorem tariff of 25 per cent as a general rate, with an intermediate rate of 22½ per cent.

The general rate applies to imports from this country and most other countries. Our nearest neighbor on the south, Mexico, admits cattle free. Cuba imposes a duty of \$1.33 per 100 pounds, live weight, on cattle, with a special duty of 79 cents per 100 pounds on imports from the United States. Brazil imposes a duty of \$14.23 per head on cattle. I will say at this point that the given Brazilian duty is higher, but as 65 per cent of the duty is payable in depreciated paper currency and only 35 per cent is payable in gold—unless there has been a change made recently—this has the effect of reducing the duty actually paid to the figures given above. The same observation holds true as to the other Brazilian rates which I shall cite. In computing these duties they have been computed on a basis of 65 per cent being payable in paper and 35 per cent in gold. Argentina admits cattle free. Japan levies an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent. Australia protects her stock growers by a duty of \$2.44 per head of cattle. New Zealand also levies a tariff of \$2.44 per head.

Now, let us see what the commercial nations of the world do with regard to the rate on horses.

Horses are protected by the Payne Act by a duty of \$30 per head if valued at \$150 or less, and an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent if valued at more than \$150. The Senate bill reduces this to 10 per cent ad valorem on all horses. England, of course, admits horses free. The general duties in France range from \$28.95 to \$43.42 per head, and the minimum duties from \$19.30 to \$28.95 per head. The German general duties range from \$21.42 to \$83.68 per head, and the conventional duties from \$17.40 to \$83.68 per head. Austria-Hungary has a general rate of \$20.30 per head if more than 2 years old, and \$10.15 if less than 2 years old, with a conventional rate of \$12.18 if more than 2 years old, and \$6.09 if less than 2 years. Belgium has no tariff on horses. The Netherlands admits them free. Italy has a tariff of \$7.72 per head. Spain levies duties ranging from \$18.72 to \$28.95 per head. Russia admits them free. Canada has a rate of \$12.50, if valued at less than \$50, and a general rate of 25 per cent ad valorem, an intermediate rate of 22½ per cent on horses valued at more than \$50. Mexico has a duty of \$24.85 per head on geldings, others free. Cuba has a general rate of \$18.75 per head, with a special rate of \$15 on horses imported from the United States. Brazil has a duty of \$27.38 per head. Argentina admits horses free. Japan has a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem. New Zealand has a duty of \$4.87 per head. Australia assesses a duty of \$2.40 per head.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has been speaking almost two hours. The day is excessively hot and some of us have been sitting here every moment for six consecutive hours. It has been understood that we would adjourn about 6 o'clock, and I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he does not think we might well take an adjournment now?

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota about how much additional time he thinks he will occupy in concluding his remarks?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say that I had very much hoped that I would be able to finish to-day. I do not object to interruptions, but I have been interrupted so much that I am not quite half through with my speech.

Mr. STONE. Not quite half through?

Mr. GRONNA. Personally I feel very much like going on and finishing, because I remember that two years ago when I took up the time of the Senate for the better part of two days I was criticized for taking so much time.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the distinguished Senator from North Dakota? Having heard him state that he has not finished more than half of his very well prepared, studious oration upon this subject, I should like to ask the Senator if it would comport with his convenience that he resume to-morrow, and that we at this time, at 6 o'clock, turn to some other business, perchance an executive session on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, and that the Senator from North Dakota resume to-morrow, if he is at a stopping point in his speech now?

Mr. GRONNA. I, of course, will gladly yield to the wishes of the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Senator, but I think it might consult the convenience and the physical relief of the Senator to pause at this time.

Mr. GRONNA. So far as I am concerned it is convenient for me to go on at any time. To-morrow will do, of course, just as well as to-day; but I want it understood that it was not especially my desire, nor is it my desire, I will say with all candor, to delay the Senate in considering the bill paragraph by paragraph. I realize as much as those who are, perhaps, more directly responsible for this legislation than I am that they want to get through with the bill, and so far as I am personally concerned I shall be very glad to go on to-day with my speech.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator could go on for about an hour—

Mr. BACON. We have some matters of importance to consider in executive session.

Mr. PENROSE. I take it for granted that the Senator from North Dakota will have the floor in the morning to continue his remarks. That will follow as a matter of course.

Mr. LEWIS. Any other course than that would be discourteous. No one on this side of the Chamber contemplates any other course.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course the Senator would go on with his speech to-morrow if we go into executive session now.

Mr. PENROSE. And then we can either adjourn or have an executive session.

Mr. BACON. We have some matters of importance to consider in executive session.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think probably we had better have an executive session.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senate that if it is expected to hold an executive session I will gladly yield at any time for that purpose.

Mr. PENROSE. Or for adjournment.

Mr. GRONNA. Or for adjournment, with the understanding, of course, that I will be permitted to finish the few observations that I have to make to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course.

Mr. PENROSE. That goes without saying. That is the Senator's right.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I think possibly the public business may be expedited by having a short executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 6 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 1, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 31, 1913.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frederick Kuenzli, of New Jersey, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of Charles W. MacDonough, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Jack Walker, of Arkansas, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas, in place of Frank W. Tucker, resigned.

Duncan C. Heyward, of South Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina. (New office.)

POSTMASTER.

ILLINOIS.

L. F. Meek to be postmaster at Peoria, Ill., in place of Henry W. Lynch, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 1913.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. John H. Beacom to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. Willis T. May to be colonel.
Maj. Leon S. Roudiez to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Albert C. Dalton to be major.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. William L. Little to be major.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. Neb B. Rehkopf to be captain.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

James Crowe Burdett.
James Bayard Clark.
William Elnathan Clark.
Melvin Starkey Henderson.
Harold Lyons Hunt.
William McCully James.
William Fletcher Knowles.
Daniel Francis Mahoney.
Scott Dudley Breckinridge.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONIES.

Le Roy E. Cummings to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak.

CHIEF OF THE WEATHER BUREAU.

Charles F. Marvin to be Chief of the Weather Bureau.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

H. L. Fuller, Waldron.

FLORIDA.

S. D. Bates, Marathon.
Al Hogeboom, Panama City.

ILLINOIS.

Charles F. Buck, Lacon.
Harry B. Fasmer, Yorkville.
John Geiss, Batavia.
Clyde V. Greenwood, Sherrard.
W. T. Holifield, Brookport.
Ross Lee, Casey.
J. M. Rumsey, Golconda.

IOWA.

Fred C. Boeke, Hubbard.
Alfred B. Callender, Ocheyedan.
Warren A. Edington, Sheldon.
J. J. McDermott, Manilla.
John McGloin, Wall Lake.
John S. Moon, Kellerton.
D. P. O'Connor, Lawler.
Edwin Wattonville, Pomeroy.

LOUISIANA.

William H. Bennett, Clinton.

MICHIGAN.

John Jay Cox, Scottville.
Henry Kessel, Orion.

NEW MEXICO.

L. A. Chandler, Cimarron.
Viola Keenan Reynolds, Springer.
George F. Williams, Mogollon.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

A. A. Closson, White Lake.
Michael Dougherty, Mount Vernon.
William J. Quirk, Kimball.
W. R. Veitch, Groton.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 31, 1913.

POSTMASTER.

J. F. Matthews to be postmaster at Crosswell, Mich.